

---

Wiltshire Local Development Framework

Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan

Statement on the informal consultation with town and parish councils on draft proposals for amending settlement boundaries – Cabinet Version

Main Report

June 2017

---

**Annex B: Report on the Informal Consultation with Town and Parish Councils on Draft Proposals for Amending Settlement Boundaries**

**January 2016**

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">Chapter 1</a>	<a href="#">Introduction</a>	202
<a href="#">Chapter 2</a>	<a href="#">Consultation methodology</a>	205
<a href="#">Chapter 3</a>	<a href="#">Representations</a>	206
<a href="#">Chapter 4</a>	<a href="#">Summary of the main issues raised by the representations</a>	208
<a href="#">Chapter 5</a>	<a href="#">Conclusions and next steps</a>	224
<a href="#">Appendix A:</a>	<a href="#">List of respondents</a>	
<a href="#">Appendix B:</a>	<a href="#">Schedule of comments in full</a>	
<a href="#">Appendix C:</a>	<a href="#">Consultation materials</a>	
<a href="#">Appendix D:</a>	<a href="#">Schedule of specific comments on individual settlements in full</a>	

---

## Chapter 1 Introduction

- 1.1. This document summarises the feedback and presents a series of actions arising from the informal consultation on settlement boundaries, undertaken with town and parish councils between July and September 2014. It also sets out the consultation process.

### Overview of the Wiltshire Site Allocations DPD

- 1.2. The Wiltshire Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), 'the Plan' will, once adopted, provide part of the Development Plan for Wiltshire. The primary role of the Plan is to support the delivery of housing growth as set out within the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The document will identify sufficient deliverable land across Wiltshire to provide surety of housing delivery over the plan period to 2026.
- 1.3. As well as identifying housing sites, the Plan will review settlement boundaries, as defined in the Wiltshire Core Strategy for: the Principal Settlements of Salisbury and Trowbridge<sup>1</sup>; Market Towns; Local Service Centres and Large Villages.
- 1.4. The document will present proposals and associated policies designed to be in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework. It will consider sites across Wiltshire, excluding Chippenham. Growth in Chippenham will be addressed in a separate DPD.

### Previous consultation on settlement boundaries

- 1.5. The first stage of writing a DPD is to undertake a Regulation 18 consultation seeking views on the scope of the document. The council sought comments on the proposed scope and undertook a call for sites exercise.
- 1.6. Comments were invited during a 6 week consultation period between Monday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2014 and Monday 5<sup>th</sup> May 2014 (inclusive).
- 1.7. The main issues raised relating to the settlement boundary review were:
  1. Comments were raised about a potential inconsistency between *Core Policy 1, and paragraphs 4.13 and 4.15* relative to the way in which the settlement boundary will be reviewed
  2. Many mentioned that previous policies should be taken into account when reviewing the boundaries to take into account settlements that have been grouped together as Large Villages in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy.
- 1.8. The Council responded as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Development sites at Chippenham are being proposed through a separate DPD

- 
1. The difference appears to be between 'can adequately reflect changes' and 'properly reflect building'. Revised boundaries will reflect the latter, which is the urban form. In terms of the wider definition of 'changes', this will depend upon the consultation feedback and the point raised will be taken into account when developing the methodology.
  2. The Plan will be reviewing the original settlement boundaries for the Principal Settlements (excluding Chippenham, which is being addressed through the Chippenham Housing Sites DPD), Market Towns and Large Villages. These were adopted as part of the former district local plans.

1.9. For further details about this consultation, see the Regulation 18 Consultation Report (December 2015).

#### **Informal settlement boundary review consultation (with town and parish councils)**

- 1.10. The informal settlement boundary review consultation took place for a period of eight weeks between Monday 28<sup>th</sup> July and Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014.
- 1.11. The consultation comprised a series of maps showing proposed new settlement boundaries for Principal Settlements (except Chippenham, which is dealt with by the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD), Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages. It specifically targeted Parish and Town Councils; as they requested to be consulted first before any formal public consultation was undertaken. A series of briefing sessions formed part of the consultation.
- 1.12. All consultation documents were available to download from the council's website and comments were accepted by email, post and through the Objective online consultation portal. Appendix C contains the consultation materials.

#### **Structure of this document**

- 1.13. Chapter 2 lists the various ways by which the council consulted upon the proposed settlement boundaries.
- 1.14. Chapter 3 provides a breakdown of the representations.
- 1.15. Chapter 4 summarises the key issues arising from the representations with officer comments.
- 1.16. Chapter 5 lists the proposed changes and sets out the next steps in the preparation of the Plan.
- 1.17. Appendix A is a list of respondents to the consultation
- 1.18. Appendix B is the schedule of comments in full

- 
- 1.19. Appendix C contains the consultation materials.
  - 1.20. Appendix D is a schedule of specific comments on individual settlements, including officer responses

---

## Chapter 2 Consultation methodology

### Consultation methods

2.1. The Council consulted on the proposed settlement boundaries in the following ways:

- Direct email/ letter notifications of the consultation and briefing sessions (including copies of the Settlement boundary review leaflet and representation form) to the 115 town and parish councils affected by the proposed settlement boundaries.
- Briefing sessions, with a presentation, for town and parish council representatives held in Calne, Salisbury and Trowbridge (see Table 2.1).
- Information was made available on the Council's dedicated web site which was open for all interested stakeholders to view and respond to.
- Comments accepted by post, email and online through the council's consultation portal.

Date	Venue	Time
Monday 28 July, 2014	Calne Town Hall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Tuesday 29 July, 2014	Salisbury Guildhall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Wednesday 30 July, 2014	Trowbridge Civic Centre	6:00pm – 7:00pm

Table 2.1 - Briefing sessions for town and parish councils

### Consultation materials

2.2. The council provided a range of consultation material either directly to the Parish and Town Councils affected by the settlement boundary review or through the Council's dedicated web page. The consultation materials consisting of (see Appendix C):

- Settlement boundary review leaflet
- Settlement boundary review representation form
- Settlement boundary review presentation (for briefing sessions)
- Individual maps for Principal Settlements (excluding Chippenham), Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages showing proposed settlement boundaries
- Consultation letter
- Briefing sessions letter

---

## Chapter 3 Representations

### Overview of representations received

- 3.1. In all, the council received representations from 136 different individuals or organisations. A number of these were received outside of the consultation period or from individuals/ organisations other than town and parish councils. However, the council took them into account for the purposes of informing the further development of the proposed settlement boundaries.

### Breakdown of respondent by type

- 3.2. Figure 3.1 below illustrates the breakdown of respondent by type. As would be expected, most responses came from town and parish councils. Other representations were received from individuals and landowners/ developers (including planning consultants).




Figure 3.1 - Breakdown of respondents by type

### Breakdown of responses by submission

- 3.3. *Figure 3.2* below illustrates the methods by which the council received representations.




Figure 3.2 - Responses by method of submission

## Chapter 4 Summary of the main issues raised by the representations

4.1. Table 4.1 summarises the main issues raised by the representations, with officer comments and proposed changes/ actions. They are ordered by the following topics:

- Consultation process
- Comments on the main criterion
- Comments on the sub-criteria for 'Areas included'
- Comments on the sub-criteria for 'Areas excluded'
- Housing delivery
- Neighbourhood planning
- Other issues.

4.2. All individual representations are available to view in full, either through the council's online consultation portal at <http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal> or in Appendix B to this document.

Table 4.1 - Summary of the main issues raised by the consultation

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
<b>Consultation process</b>	Object to consultation being restricted to parish councils. All parties should have had the opportunity to comment.	Noted. However, this was an additional, informal stage of consultation with parish councils. The decision to solely engage at this stage with parish councils was taken because they are elected to represent their respective communities and have detailed knowledge of their local area. In the interests of transparency, the proposed new boundaries (July 2014)	<b>None.</b> However, revised new settlement boundaries will be published for a formal, public consultation in 2016.

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
		have been publically available on the council's website since the start of the consultation and members of the public have been able to comment on the proposals.	
	Provide supporting information to accompany revised settlement boundaries, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHLAA sites</li> <li>• Planning and environmental constraints</li> <li>• Comparison of potential development land within existing and proposed boundaries</li> <li>• Pending (including appeals) and granted planning permissions</li> </ul>	Agreed. It may be beneficial to provide some contextual information to support the revised new boundaries.	<b>1.</b> To consider what supporting information could be provided to provide context for the revised settlement boundary maps
	Concern over significant delay to the timetable for preparation of Housing Sites DPD	Noted. However, the timetable has been reviewed in light of the outcome of the informal consultation undertaken earlier this year and the need to continue to develop a robust evidence base to support the Plan. An updated timeline, which is available on the <a href="#">Council's website</a> , replaces that set out in the January 2015 version of the LDS.	<b>None.</b>
	Unclear over the exclusion of Chippenham from Settlement Boundary Review	Chippenham has not been excluded from the Settlement Boundary Review. The review of Chippenham's settlement boundary is being undertaken as part of the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD, which was submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2015.	<b>None.</b>
	Maps need to identify specific reason for each	A table has been produced to show	<b>2.</b> To provide an explanation of

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	change to the existing boundary to provide clarity and determine whether criteria have been correctly applied	changes for each settlement.	each change made to the original settlement boundaries, linked to the relevant criteria in the methodology
	Show how the comments made during the Regulation 18 consultation have informed the development of the criteria used in the settlement boundary review methodology.	Agreed but this will be as part of the report on the Regulation 18 consultation. Feedback from that consultation is also referenced in this report and the settlement boundary review background paper.	<b>3.</b> To publish a report on the Regulation 18 consultation
	Unclear why Housing Sites DPD includes proposals for revised settlement boundaries as document relates specifically to housing site allocations	The purpose of the Wiltshire Site Allocations DPD is to identify further housing site allocations <b>and</b> review existing settlement boundaries.	<b>None.</b>
	Unclear whether there will be any further consultation on/ changes to settlement boundaries	There will be a formal, pre-submission consultation on the Wiltshire Site Allocations DPD in 2017. This consultation will include further housing site allocations and revised new settlement boundaries.	<b>None.</b>
	Use the most up-to-date maps, showing recent developments and extensions.	Agreed.	<b>4.</b> To ensure that the maps used are the most up-to-date available
	Ensure that the delineation of the revised settlement boundaries is clearly shown on the maps, i.e. by reducing the thickness of the line to ease identification of features	Agreed. As much clarity as possible on the exact position of the settlement boundary line is to be desired	<b>5.</b> To more clearly show the line of the settlement boundary on the map
	Lack of reference to current land ownership	Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the extent of the built form of the settlement,	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
		not current patterns of land ownership.	
	Concern over why settlement boundary review taking place prior to publication of housing targets for Large Villages. Should be the other way around.	Noted. However, these have now been published.	<b>None.</b>
	Lack of coordination with other reviews and consultations, e.g. Community Governance Review, neighbouring planning and Army Basing Plan	The settlement boundaries set out the limits of development. They are a planning tool that reflect the extent of the built environment and do not relate to parish boundaries. Settlement boundaries can also be reviewed through neighbourhood plans.	<b>None.</b>
	Consider the use of PSMA mapping when sharing maps with parish councils	The Council would certainly be interested in displaying the final adopted maps as a publically accessible GIS layer.	<b>6.</b> To consider the most practical way of displaying and sharing the maps
<b>Main criterion</b> <i>“Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement”</i>	Apply the methodology for determining the revised settlement boundaries consistently	Agreed but recognising the fact that in some cases it will come down to officer judgement. However, individual explanations of each change, linked back to methodology criteria, will help provide consistency.	<b>7.</b> To apply the methodology consistently (to be aided by individual justification of each change as per the point above) but recognising that it will come down to officer judgement in some cases
	Support for boundaries following clearly defined physical features	Noted. Thank you.	<b>None.</b>
	Criteria should not be absolute and boundaries should reflect local/ historical context	Noted. The Council will take into account comments submitted by parish councils and others that reflect their knowledge of local circumstances.	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	Confusion between identifying new building land and redefining existing residential areas	Noted. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the change in the built form since the original boundaries were adopted. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD will also identify further housing site allocations.	<b>None.</b>
	In many cases, boundaries should be kept at a distance from a water course. Otherwise, could impact on flood risk (CP67) and nature conservation interests. For instance, Saved Policy R16 (Salisbury DLP) supports retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access	Noted. It is proposed to draw settlement boundaries to relate to the built up area of a town. Green space on the edge of settlements would be excluded. Where a green space and/or watercourse run through a town and are therefore within the built up area of the town other already adopted policies, including those referenced, protect those assets including areas of nature conservation interest and at risk of flooding. .	<b>None.</b>
	Other green corridors, not just rivers, leading from countryside into built environment need to be protected from development (CP52)	Noted. However, the existence of a settlement boundary does not mean that development would automatically be permitted right up to the settlement boundary. Other policies, including those referenced, address the issue of protecting green corridors.	<b>None.</b>
	Criterion should take into account relevant designations and planning policies when defining settlement boundary, e.g. AONBs	Noted. The Council will take all relevant information into account in the preparation of the revised new settlement boundaries.	<b>None.</b>
	If intention is to draw line on built side of a road/ lane forming a boundary, rather than including said road/ lane, then this should be explicitly stated as a general principle that is being	Agreed. Making it clear that the line will follow but not include physical features, such as roads and water courses, would be helpful.	<b>8.</b> To include text in the methodology to explain that the line will follow but not include clearly defined physical

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	applied		features, such as roads and water courses
	Change to reflect correct meaning of word: “Where <i>practical</i> the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement”	Agreed. The use of the word ‘practicable’ is more appropriate grammatically.	<b>9.</b> To replace the word ‘practical’ with the suggested ‘practicable’
	Ensure “removable boundaries” linked to permanent features to avoid ‘boundary creep’	Noted. The intention, expressed in the criterion, is to follow clearly defined physical features.	<b>None.</b>
	Avoid placing the revised settlement boundaries through a group of buildings with a common purpose/ ownership	The methodology focuses on clarifying the built form of a settlement, rather than reflecting ownership patterns. Some buildings under the same ownership may be physically dispersed both in relation to each other and the rest of the settlement. Therefore, in some cases, they cannot be said to reflect the built form of the settlement. However, the physical relationship between groups of buildings and the rest of the settlement will be looked at in light of consultation feedback.	<b>10.</b> To consider the physical relationship between groups of buildings when drawing the settlement boundary
<b>Areas included</b> (general comments)	Too simplistic, i.e. some development might be physically close but not functionally compliant	Agreed. A building may be ‘functionally related’ to the settlement but could be some distance away and so not considered to be part of the built form of the settlement.	<b>11.</b> To remove the word ‘functionally’
	‘Functionally’ too imprecise and does not help to define settlement limits, e.g. a garage and a	Agreed. A building may be ‘functionally related’ to the settlement but could be	<b>See Action 11</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	household amenity site located several miles away could be said to be functionally related to a settlement if people use the facilities	some distance away and so not considered to be part of the built form of the settlement.	
<b>Areas included</b>  <i>“both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement”</i>	Deletion: <i>“Both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement”</i>  <i>See above comment under <b>Areas included</b> (general comments)</i>	Agreed. A building may be ‘functionally related’ to the settlement but could be some distance away and so not considered to be part of the built form of the settlement.	<b>See Action 11</b>
	Settlement boundaries should only include residential development (as in West Wilts Local Plan) and exclude all other uses, e.g. employment use, religious buildings, schools and community halls	The settlement boundary review will update existing boundaries and harmonise the different approaches taken by the former district councils. At its simplest, the settlement boundary is simply the dividing line between areas of built/ urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development (the open countryside). Other policies in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy address proposals for change of use from type of development to another.	<b>None.</b>
	There should be a separate boundary for employment uses. Different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.	At its simplest, the settlement boundary is simply the dividing line between areas of built/ urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development (the open countryside). Other policies in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy address proposals for change of use from type of development to another.	<b>None.</b>
	Have planning applicants been consulted?	The informal consultations only involved	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	Concern that planning applications going through the process, or granted permission, are not reflected on the boundary maps	town and parish councils. However, the Council will take all relevant and up-to-date information into account when preparing the revised new settlement boundaries.	
<b>Areas included</b> <i>“existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/ functionally related to the settlement”</i>	Outlying community facilities that relate more to the rural edge should be excluded if it enables a clearer, more defined boundary	Noted. However, this would be covered by the existing criteria.	<b>None.</b>
	To improve clarity, amend:  <i>“existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/ functionally related to the settlement”</i>	Agreed. This is more precise and reflects the purpose of settlement boundaries, which is to show the built form of settlements.	<b>12.</b> To replace the word ‘existing’ with ‘built’
	Deletion: “existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/ <b>functionally</b> related to the settlement”	Agreed. A building may be ‘functionally related’ to the settlement but could be some distance away and so not considered to be part of the built form of the settlement.	<b>See Action 11</b>
	All community facilities, including community halls with attached recreational grounds, school playgrounds and fenced open play areas, should be included in their entirety within the boundary	Noted. However, the criterion already sufficiently addresses the relationship between community facilities and the settlement.	<b>None.</b>
<b>Areas included</b> <i>“site allocations identified in the</i>	Remove allocations/ development proposals/ permissions from within the settlement boundary. Also, allocated sites should not be included without further consultation with the	Agreed. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the built form of the settlement. By definition, allocations, development proposals and	<b>13.</b> To consider removing allocations/ development proposals/ planning permissions from within the

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
<i>development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement"</i>	local community.	unimplemented planning permissions are not yet built and, as details could still be subject to change, the proposed extent of the built environment is unknown. They can be added at a later date when the settlement boundary is reviewed again.	settlement boundary.
	Deletion: <i>"site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/<del>functionally</del> related to the settlement"</i>	Agreed. A building may be 'functionally related' to the settlement but could be some distance away and so not considered to be part of the built form of the settlement.	<b>See Action 11</b>
	Limited support for including allocations/development proposals. Settlement boundaries need to take into account past and future (allocated) development to ensure they are a useful planning tool and not continually undermined by permissions granted outside them	Disagree. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the built form of the settlement. By definition, allocations, development proposals and unimplemented planning permissions are not yet built and, as details could still be subject to change, the proposed extent of the built environment is unknown. They can be added at a later date when the settlement boundary is reviewed again.	<b>See Action 13</b>
<b>Areas included</b>  (other suggestions)	Include the following within the revised settlement boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway verges (Wiltshire Council owned and maintained)</li> <li>• MOD service family accommodation ('outside the wire'), likely to be permanent residential accommodation and foster integration of military families within the community</li> </ul>	Agree, except where this would conflict with the revised settlement boundary review methodology. This should be covered by the methodology.	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
<p><b>Areas excluded</b></p> <p><i>“curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens”</i></p>	<p>Strong support for including large gardens and objection to their bisection/ removal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other planning restrictions exist to prevent garden development</li> <li>• Debate over what constitutes a ‘large garden’ – unspecified and subjective</li> <li>• Conflict with criterion that boundary should follow clearly defined physical features, e.g. walls, fences, hedgerows etc.</li> <li>• If property within boundary then both building <u>and</u> curtilage form a planning unit and both should be within boundary</li> <li>• Boundary should follow edge of large gardens in built up areas but it may be that whole properties on edge of settlements should be excluded where a few houses are not well related to a settlement and there’s no wish to extend the settlement</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. The Council recognises the strength of feeling about the inclusion of gardens within the settlement boundary and will adopt a more flexible approach towards large gardens. However, this needs to be balanced with situations where the curtilage of a property substantially extends the built form of a settlement. In some cases, this may come down to officer judgement, as has been the case for other local authorities undertaking a similar exercise.</p>	<p><b>14.</b> To consider including curtilages of properties, including gardens, except where they have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement</p>
<p><b>Areas excluded</b></p> <p><i>“recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)”</i></p>	<p>Criteria relating to exclusion of recreational or amenity space unclear</p>	<p>Disagree. Recreational or amenity space on the edge of settlements that relates primarily to the countryside, rather than the settlement, will be excluded from within the settlement boundary and, thus, protected from development.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Include formal, maintained play areas but exclude informal open space</p>	<p>Noted. Covered by existing criteria.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Support for inclusion of recreational or other open land that is attached to the settlement and serves the functions of the settlement</p>	<p>Noted. Covered by existing criteria.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
<b>Areas excluded</b> <i>“isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)”</i>	Isolated’ not useful, means ‘far away’, if ‘isolated’ then obviously cannot be part of settlement	Noted. However, this is the reason why it is not within the settlement boundary.	<b>None.</b>
	Unclear why the term ‘visually’ is used instead of ‘functionally’, which is used for areas included.	Action 11 proposes deleting the term ‘functionally’ from the draft methodology. The use of the term ‘visually’ alongside ‘physically’ would seem superfluous and, in the interests of simplicity and consistency, the term ‘visually’ should be deleted.	<b>15.</b> To delete the word ‘visually’
	Apply more strictly to create more defined settlement boundary	The criteria will be applied consistently across the county.	<b>None.</b>
	Inconsistent with encouraging small development suitable for a rural area, e.g. re-use of dilapidated farm sites	There are separate policies that address rural development, including the conversion of rural buildings, i.e. Core Policy 48, <i>Supporting Rural Life</i> .	<b>None.</b>
	Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together	Noted. However, this would depend upon their proximity to the main settlement.	<b>None.</b>
<b>Areas excluded</b> (other suggestions)	Exclude the following from the settlement boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• former military sites (until planning permission granted)</li> <li>• Biodiversity habitats/ landscape features at edge of settlements that relate to countryside</li> <li>• MOD single living accommodation (‘within the wire’)</li> </ul>	Agree, except where this would conflict with the revised settlement boundary review methodology. Therefore, this should already be covered by the methodology.	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
Housing delivery	<p>When parishes are told they may have to identify land for further housing, the proposed boundaries provide little opportunity to deliver new housing to meet NPPF and Core Strategy targets by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making only minor additions and removing land from existing boundary</li> <li>• tightly constraining settlements</li> <li>• excluding large gardens</li> <li>• protecting amenity land</li> <li>• excluding SHLAA sites</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the extent of the built form. While SHLAA sites would not be included, large gardens now would be (as they form the curtilage of built development), except where they substantially increase the built form of a settlement. However, settlement boundaries can also be reviewed through neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p><b>16.</b> To consider retaining land included in the existing settlement boundaries, except where this would conflict with the methodology.</p>
	<p>Proposed boundaries appear to be harmonised with Housing Restraint Areas (HRAs) from Salisbury District Local Plan, often with the effect of making the proposed boundaries far larger than the existing boundary and implying capacity for development and growth. However, the original principle of HRAs was that new development should be very limited, i.e. to extensions, subdivisions and single new dwellings. Thus, new dwellings in former HRAs are likely to be acceptable in isolated cases</p>	<p>Policy H16, <i>Housing Restraint Areas</i>, states that development will take place on unidentified sites within these settlements through conversion, infill development, small development sites and redevelopment.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.41 goes onto to clarify that 'small development sites' will normally contain in the region of 9-10 dwellings, although it will vary depending upon the site and type of housing proposed. Smaller settlements might only see a development of 3-4 dwellings, whereas it could be more in larger settlements.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Confusion about bringing sites forward, either through inclusion with settlement boundary or SHLAA process</p>	<p>The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the extent of the built environment. Potential development sites were submitted through the SHLAA process, which informs the site assessment process for the Housing Sites DPD.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	Selection criteria leads to potential for large scale developments in settlements with better facilities, rather than wider distribution leading to smaller, well-integrated plots. Prefer small, local sites within village boundary or where village boundary can be amended with minor ironing out of indentations of the boundary.	Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the extent of the built environment. The selection criteria are derived from Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy. Potential development sites were submitted through the SHLAA process, which informs the site assessment process for the Housing Sites DPD.	<b>None.</b>
	Increase density of rural homes to reduce impact on countryside	Noted. However, the density of rural development is not a matter for the settlement boundary review.	<b>None.</b>
	Restrict large scale developments to major employment areas	The size of development will be commensurate with the surrounding uses and availability of supporting infrastructure.	<b>None.</b>
	Building on brownfield land should proceed alongside windfall sites but must have regard to the local infrastructure	All development proposals are assessed with regard to the provision of necessary infrastructure.	<b>None.</b>
<b>Neighbourhood planning</b>	Need to clarify relationship between Housing Sites DPD and neighbourhood plans	Both the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD and neighbourhood plans have the ability to amend the settlement boundary. Proposed amendments to the original settlement boundaries within sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plans will be taken into account in the review of settlement boundaries.	<b>17.</b> To consider proposed amendments to settlement boundaries within sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plans.
	Need to clarify that proposed boundaries could be subject to further changes arising from any	Both the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD and neighbourhood plans have the ability to	<b>See Action 17</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	neighbourhood plans	amend the settlement boundary. Proposed amendments to the original settlement boundaries within sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plans will be taken into account in the review of settlement boundaries.	
	Settlement boundaries in neighbourhood plans should take precedence	Both the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD and neighbourhood plans have the ability to amend the settlement boundary. Proposed amendments to the original settlement boundaries within sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plans will be taken into account in the review of settlement boundaries.	<b>See Action 17</b>
<b>Other issues</b>	Concern that where the settlement boundary crosses an individual property, then that property would be in two different parishes	The settlement boundary is a planning tool used to reflect the extent of the built environment and does not demarcate between administrative parishes.	<b>None.</b>
	Concern that excluding large gardens and drawing the boundary close to the property will remove permitted development rights	The settlement boundary is a planning tool used to reflect the extent of the built environment and does not affect on permitted development rights.	<b>None.</b>
	Concern about effect on property value if garden is taken outside the settlement boundary – compensation?	The settlement boundary is a planning tool used to reflect the extent of the built environment and does not affect on permitted development rights.	<b>None.</b>
	Once adopted, boundary should remain unchanged until next review and all planning applications outside of the boundary should be refused	Agreed.	<b>None.</b>

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	<p>Small Villages should have settlement boundaries too:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to protect strategic gap between small villages</li> <li>• to provide future housing for young families and local people</li> <li>• to enable employment facilities to grow and prosper</li> <li>• to support village facilities</li> <li>• to allow small amounts of growth to reduce burden on larger villages</li> <li>• One or two houses in a small village has less impact than large bolt-on development on edge of larger settlement</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. However, this is inconsistent with Core Policy 1 <i>Settlement Strategy</i> in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015).</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Concern about erosion of gaps between settlements</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the extent of the built environment and to prevent any inappropriate development.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Need to consider infrastructure/ utility/ employment requirements – lanes in some villages cannot accommodate increased housing, parking and modern levels of traffic</p>	<p>Noted. All development proposals are assessed with regard to the provision of necessary infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Remove boundaries and decide applications on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>This is inconsistent with Core Policy 1 <i>Settlement Strategy</i> in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015).</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Review conservation area boundaries</p>	<p>This is not part of the settlement boundary review.</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>
	<p>Difficult supporting proposed boundaries, which are a snapshot in time/ incorrect as developers</p>	<p>Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect the</p>	<p><b>None.</b></p>

---

Topic	Issues	Officer response	Actions
	proposing/ planning new development outside and Wiltshire Council preparing to allocate unknown number of houses to large villages	extent of the built environment. It will be updated in future plans to reflect further development in the intervening period.	

## Appendix A – List of respondents

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
1	Robert Tallon	Brokenborough Parish Council	851849	Malmesbury	MT(N)	<a href="#">1</a>
2	Graham Dawkins		852023	Collingbourne Ducis	LV(E)	<a href="#">2</a>
3	Michael Cox		852283	Collingbourne Ducis	LV(E)	<a href="#">3</a>
4	John Badgery		853816	Orcheston	SV(S)*	<a href="#">4</a>
5	Mark Maidment		854200	Chapmanslade	LV(W)	<a href="#">5</a>
6	David Robertson	Hindon Parish Council	854597	Hindon	LV(S)	<a href="#">6</a>
7	Sam Lloyd		854893	Salisbury	PS(S)	<a href="#">7</a>
8	John Gately	Savills	449160	General (South Wiltshire)		<a href="#">8</a>
9	Glen Goodwin	Pegasus Planning Group	390736	Burbage	LV(E)	<a href="#">9</a>
10	Paul Johnson		855231	Burbage	LV(E)	<a href="#">10</a>
11	Frank Hughes & Jehanne Le Quesne		438019	Kington St Michael	LV(N)	<a href="#">11</a>
12	Mark Simpson	DPDS Consulting	556073	Melksham	MT(W)	<a href="#">12</a>
13	Will Templer		856196	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">13</a>
14	Michael Perry	Bishopstrow Parish Council	709291	Bishopstrow	SV(W)	<a href="#">14</a>
15	Gary Brain	Colerne Parish Council	856295	Colerne	LV(N)	<a href="#">15</a> ; <a href="#">191</a> ; <a href="#">192</a>
16	Marylyn Timms	Hilperton Parish Council	392128	Hilperton	LV(W)	<a href="#">16</a> ; <a href="#">18</a> ; <a href="#">19</a> ; <a href="#">20</a> ; <a href="#">21</a> ; <a href="#">22</a> ; <a href="#">23</a> ; <a href="#">24</a> ; <a href="#">25</a> ; <a href="#">26</a> ; <a href="#">27</a> ; <a href="#">28</a> ; <a href="#">29</a> ; <a href="#">30</a> ; <a href="#">31</a> ; <a href="#">32</a> ; <a href="#">33</a> ; <a href="#">34</a> ; <a href="#">35</a> ; <a href="#">36</a>
17	Robert Leonard		856337	Steeple Ashton	LV(W)	<a href="#">37</a>
18	Richard Cosker	RCC Town Planning	856708	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">38</a>

<sup>2</sup> Settlement hierarchy = PS (principal settlement); MT (market town); LSC (local service centre); LV (large village); SV (small village)

<sup>3</sup> Area = N (north); E (east); W (west); S (south)

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
19	Kevin Watson	Christian Malford Parish Council	479874	Christian Malford	LV(N)	<a href="#">39</a> ; <a href="#">40</a>
20	Louis Hoareau	Codford Parish Council	857248	Codford	LV(W)	<a href="#">41</a> ; <a href="#">42</a> ; <a href="#">74</a> ; <a href="#">75</a> ; <a href="#">76</a> ; <a href="#">77</a>
21	Maria Pennington	Whiteparish Parish Council	500702	Whiteparish	LV(S)	<a href="#">43</a> ; <a href="#">44</a> ; <a href="#">45</a> ; <a href="#">46</a> ; <a href="#">47</a> ; <a href="#">48</a> ; <a href="#">49</a>
22	Peter Baxter	West Lavington Parish Council	857754	West Lavington	LV(E)	<a href="#">50</a> ; <a href="#">51</a> ; <a href="#">52</a> ; <a href="#">53</a> ; <a href="#">54</a> ; <a href="#">55</a> ; <a href="#">56</a> ; <a href="#">57</a> ; <a href="#">58</a> ; <a href="#">59</a>
23	Lance Allan	Trowbridge Town Council	391073	Trowbridge	PS(W)	<a href="#">60</a>
24	Teresa Strange	Melksham Without Parish Council	857749	Melksham	MT(W)	<a href="#">61</a> ; <a href="#">62</a> ; <a href="#">63</a> ; <a href="#">64</a> ; <a href="#">65</a> ; <a href="#">66</a> ; <a href="#">67</a> ; <a href="#">68</a> ;
25	Peter Arnall		391369	Corsham	MT(N)	<a href="#">69</a> ; <a href="#">70</a> ; <a href="#">71</a> ; <a href="#">72</a> ; <a href="#">89</a>
26	Jan Urbanski		857920	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">73</a>
27	Veronica Hourihane	Ashton Keynes Parish Council	857971	Ashton Keynes	LV(N)	<a href="#">78</a>
28	Nicky Ashton	Redlynch Parish Council	839834	Morgan's Vale/ Woodfalls	LV(S)	<a href="#">79</a> ; <a href="#">80</a> ; <a href="#">81</a> ; <a href="#">82</a>
29	Jeff Penfold	Malmesbury Town Council	647682	Malmesbury	MT(N)	<a href="#">83</a> ; <a href="#">84</a> ; <a href="#">85</a> ; <a href="#">86</a>
30	Andrew Pearce	Holt Parish Council	456561	Holt	LV(W)	<a href="#">87</a>
31	Geoff Turner	Calne Without Parish Council	390473	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">88</a>
32	Sarah Burden	Idmiston Parish Council	558768	Idmiston	SV(S)	<a href="#">90</a>
33	Myles Young		856261	Burbage	LV(E)	<a href="#">91</a>
34	Julie Norman		730331	Cricklade	LSC(N)	<a href="#">92</a>
35	Mary Towle	Durrington Town Council	390612	Durrington	MT(S)	<a href="#">93</a>
36	Linda Roberts	Calne Town Council	812393	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">94</a>
37	Deborah James	Coombe Bissett & Homington Parish Council	391796	Combe Bissett	LV(S)	<a href="#">95</a>
38	Stan Johnston	Roundway Parish Council	849961	Roundaway	SV(E)	<a href="#">96</a>

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
39	Roger Coleman	Southwick Parish Council	712546	Southwick	LV(W)	<a href="#">97</a>
40	Marion Barton	Shrewton Parish Council	558192	Shrewton	LV(S)	<a href="#">98</a> ; <a href="#">99</a> ; <a href="#">100</a> ; <a href="#">101</a> ; <a href="#">102</a> ; <a href="#">103</a>
41	Timothy Vince		858377	Semington	LV(W)	<a href="#">104</a>
42	Gavin Lester		858396	Chippenham	PS(N)	<a href="#">105</a>
43	Roger Budgen	St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council	858440	Malmesbury	MT(N)	<a href="#">106</a>
44	Charlotte Rogers-Jones	Cricklade Town Council	837407	Cricklade	LSC(N)	<a href="#">107</a> ; <a href="#">108</a> ; <a href="#">109</a> ; <a href="#">110</a> ; <a href="#">111</a> ;
45	Steven Hall		858504	Semington	LV(W)	<a href="#">112</a>
46	Beverley Cornish	Downton Parish Council	467669	Downton	LSC(S)	<a href="#">113</a>
47	Richard Wharton		448272	Alderbury	LV(S)	<a href="#">114</a>
48	Vincent Mobey			Cricklade	LSC(N)	<a href="#">115</a>
49	Roger Coleman	Semington Parish Council	396082	Semington	LV(W)	<a href="#">116</a>
50	Reg Williams	Salisbury City Council	820831	Salisbury	PS(S)	<a href="#">117</a> ; <a href="#">118</a> ; <a href="#">119</a> ; <a href="#">120</a> ; <a href="#">121</a> ; <a href="#">122</a>
51	Melissa Atyeo	Sutton Veny Parish Council	858536	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">123</a>
52	Veronica Hourihane	Oaksey Parish Council	858541	Oaksey	LV(N)	<a href="#">124</a>
53	Kirsty Gilby	Corsham Town Council	403912	Corsham	MT(N)	<a href="#">125</a> ; <a href="#">126</a> ; <a href="#">127</a> ; <a href="#">128</a> ; <a href="#">129</a> ; <a href="#">130</a> ; <a href="#">131</a> ; <a href="#">132</a> ; <a href="#">133</a> ; <a href="#">134</a> ; <a href="#">135</a> ; <a href="#">136</a> ; <a href="#">137</a> ; <a href="#">138</a> ; <a href="#">139</a> ; <a href="#">140</a> ; <a href="#">141</a> ; <a href="#">142</a> ; <a href="#">143</a> ; <a href="#">144</a> ; <a href="#">145</a> ; <a href="#">146</a> ; <a href="#">147</a> ; <a href="#">148</a> ;
54	Brian Toogood		858571	Urchfont	LV(E)	<a href="#">149</a> ; <a href="#">150</a> ; <a href="#">151</a>
55	Tony Gregson	Great Somerford Neighbourhood	858606	Great Somerford	LV(N)	<a href="#">152</a> ; <a href="#">153</a>

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
		Planning Steering Group				
56	Margaret Carey	Box Parish Council	432813	Box	LV(N)	<a href="#">154</a> ; <a href="#">155</a> ; <a href="#">156</a> ;
57	Keith Cockerton	Collingbourne Ducis Parish Council	858635	Collingbourne Ducis	LV(E)	<a href="#">157</a>
58	Jonathan Clark		858654	Chippenham	PS(N)	<a href="#">158</a>
59	Karin Elder	Heywood Parish Council	840457	Westbury	MT(W)	<a href="#">159</a>
60	Susan Findlay	Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council	858681	Ramsbury	LV(E)	<a href="#">160</a> ; <a href="#">161</a> ; <a href="#">162</a> ; <a href="#">343</a>
61	Lynda Beaven	Steeple Ashton Parish Council	825520	Steeple Ashton	LV(W)	<a href="#">163</a> ; <a href="#">164</a> ; <a href="#">165</a> ; <a href="#">166</a>
62	Amanda McCann	Westbury Town Council	840677	Westbury	MT(W)	<a href="#">167</a> ; <a href="#">168</a> ; <a href="#">169</a> ; <a href="#">170</a> ; <a href="#">171</a> ; <a href="#">172</a> ; <a href="#">173</a> ; <a href="#">174</a> ; <a href="#">175</a> ; <a href="#">176</a> ; <a href="#">177</a> ; <a href="#">178</a> ; <a href="#">179</a> ; <a href="#">180</a> ; <a href="#">181</a> ; <a href="#">182</a> ; <a href="#">183</a> ;
63	Helen Sutton		858807	Chippenham	PS(N)	<a href="#">184</a>
64	Horace Prickett	North Bradley Parish Council	830542	North Bradley	LV(W)	<a href="#">185</a>
65	Sally Simms		858824	Chippenham	PS(N)	<a href="#">186</a>
66	Sally Hoddinott	Potterne Parish Council	840732	Potterne	LV(E)	<a href="#">187</a>
67	S+J OFM		858632	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">188</a> ; <a href="#">189</a> ; <a href="#">190</a>
68	Carly Lovell	Tidworth Town Council	407444	Tidworth	MT(E)	<a href="#">193</a>
69	John Clee	Bulford Parish Council	445483	Bulford	MT(S)	<a href="#">194</a> ; <a href="#">195</a>
70	Beccy Santhouse		858947	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">196</a> ; <a href="#">228</a>
71	Roger Coleman	Dilton Marsh Parish Council	391586	Dilton Marsh	LV(W)	<a href="#">197</a>
72	Nicola Duke	West Tisbury Parish Council	467567	West Tisbury	LSC(S)	<a href="#">198</a> ; <a href="#">199</a> ; <a href="#">200</a> ; <a href="#">201</a> ; <a href="#">203</a> ; <a href="#">204</a> ; <a href="#">205</a> ; <a href="#">206</a> ; <a href="#">209</a>
73	Dominic Hickey		858954	Urchfont	LV(E)	<a href="#">202</a>

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
74	R.J. Bean		858959	Urchfont	LV(E)	<a href="#">207</a>
75	Paul Morrison		858964	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">208</a>
76	Alan Evans		858968	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">210</a>
77	Carol Hackett	Market Lavington Parish Council	924012	Market Lavington	LSC(E)	<a href="#">211</a>
78	Bob Lunn	Urchfont Parish Council	398000	Urchfont	LV(E)	<a href="#">212</a> ; <a href="#">215</a> ; <a href="#">216</a> ; <a href="#">217</a> ; <a href="#">218</a> ;
79	Christina Musselwhite	Great Wishford Parish Council	848456	Great Wishford	LV(S)	<a href="#">213</a>
80	Emma Windsor	Bradford on Avon Town Council	467835	Bradford on Avon	MT(W)	<a href="#">214</a>
81	A & MH Shannon		858984	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">219</a> ; <a href="#">229</a>
82	Stephen Whitmore	Broad Chalke Parish Council	391656	Broad Chalke	LV(S)	<a href="#">220</a> ; <a href="#">337</a>
83	Stephen Colling	Burbage Parish Council	857990	Burbage	LV(E)	<a href="#">221</a> ; <a href="#">230</a> ; <a href="#">231</a> ; <a href="#">232</a> ; <a href="#">233</a> ; <a href="#">234</a> ; <a href="#">235</a>
84	Amanda Atkins	Britford Parish Council	390337	Britford	SV(S)	<a href="#">222</a> ; <a href="#">223</a> ; <a href="#">224</a> ; <a href="#">225</a>
85	Joe Durrant		859004	Chippenham	PS(N)	<a href="#">226</a>
86	Phil Jefferson	Chapmanslade Parish Council	859006	Chapmanslade	LV(W)	<a href="#">227</a>
87	Drena Frankham		476783	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">236</a>
88	Ian Frankham		859034	Calne	MT(N)	<a href="#">237</a>
89	Jane Anderson		859037	Codford	LV(W)	<a href="#">238</a>
90	Emma Tyler	Kington St Michael Parish Council	859041	Kington St Micheael	LV(N)	<a href="#">239</a>
91	Andy Harvard	Fovant Parish Council	859044	Fovant	LV(S)	<a href="#">240</a>
92	Peter Baxter	Worton Parish Council	785423	Worton	LV(E)	<a href="#">241</a> ; <a href="#">242</a> ; <a href="#">243</a> ; <a href="#">244</a> ; <a href="#">245</a> ; <a href="#">246</a>
93	B. Wells		836022	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">247</a>
94	Lindsey Woods	Kilminster Parish Council	468232	Kilminster	SV(W)	<a href="#">248</a>
95	Lindsey Woods	West Knoyle Parish Council	392667	West Knoyle	SV(S)	<a href="#">249</a>
96	Alison McGowan	Alderbury Parish Council	848894	Alderbury	LV(S)	<a href="#">250</a>

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
97	G. Cowan		859308	Upavon	SV(E)	<a href="#">251</a> ; <a href="#">252</a> ; <a href="#">253</a> ; <a href="#">254</a> ; <a href="#">255</a> ; <a href="#">256</a> ; <a href="#">257</a> ; <a href="#">258</a> ; <a href="#">259</a> ; <a href="#">260</a>
98	Sandra Harry	Tisbury Parish Council	391632	Tisbury	LSC(S)	<a href="#">261</a>
99	Jane Tier	Winterslow Parish Council	391900	Winterslow	LV(S)	<a href="#">262</a> ; <a href="#">263</a> ; <a href="#">264</a> ; <a href="#">265</a> ; <a href="#">266</a> ; <a href="#">267</a> ; <a href="#">268</a> ; <a href="#">269</a> ; <a href="#">270</a> ; <a href="#">271</a> ; <a href="#">325</a> ; <a href="#">326</a> <a href="#">327</a>
100	Shelley Parker	Marlborough Town Council	820230	Marlborough	MT(E)	<a href="#">272</a>
101	Jim & Sandra George	Warminster	861780/ 861790	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">273</a> ; <a href="#">274</a>
102	Lee Van Kassel & Stephanie Carrol		861798	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">275</a>
103	Roger Walton, Jean Walton & Hazel Cross		861812	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">276</a>
104	Rebekah Jeffries	Rowde Parish Council	825519	Rowde	LV(E)	<a href="#">277</a>
105	Karen Clay	Aldbourne Parish Council	390198	Aldbourne	LV(E)	<a href="#">278</a>
106	Sharon Neal	Hullavington Parish Council	849874	Hullavington	LV(N)	<a href="#">279</a>
107	Mike Whelan	Crudwell Parish Council	861973/ 862330	Crudwell	LV(N)	<a href="#">280</a> ; <a href="#">283</a> ; <a href="#">284</a> ; <a href="#">285</a> ; <a href="#">286</a> ; <a href="#">287</a> ; <a href="#">288</a> ; <a href="#">289</a> ; <a href="#">290</a>
108	Alan Watson		861979	Aldbourne	LV(E)	<a href="#">281</a>
109	William Drury	William Drury Ltd	391281	Sutton Benger	LV(N)	<a href="#">282</a>
110	Paul Cunningham	Netherhampton Parish Council	862429	Netherhampton	SV(S)	<a href="#">291</a> ; <a href="#">292</a> ; <a href="#">293</a> ; <a href="#">294</a> ; <a href="#">295</a>
111	Michael Swann		862453	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">296</a>
112	N& SC Dowling		862862	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">297</a>
113	John Matthews	Sherston Parish Council	862921	Sherston	LV(N)	<a href="#">298</a>
114	Barry Clark		862924	Winterslow	LV(S)	<a href="#">299</a>
115	Simon Fisher	Devizes Town Council	550257	Devizes	MT(E)	<a href="#">300</a>
116	Charmian Spickernell		402713	Pewsey	LSC(E)	<a href="#">304</a>

#	Consultee Name	Consultee Organisation	Consultee ID	Settlement	Hierarchy <sup>2</sup> (Area) <sup>3</sup>	Comment ID(s)
117	Steve Gray	Melksham Town Council	549123	Melksham	MT(W)	<a href="#">305</a>
118	Ian Blair-Pilling	Netheravon Parish Council	549094	Netheravon	LV(E)	<a href="#">306</a>
119	CathyTitcombe	Salisbury City Council	393725	Salisbury	PS(S)	<a href="#">307</a> ; <a href="#">308</a> ; <a href="#">309</a> ; <a href="#">310</a> ; <a href="#">311</a> ; <a href="#">312</a>
120	Lindsey Wood	Mere Parish Council	477226	Mere	LSC(S)	<a href="#">313</a> ; <a href="#">314</a> ; <a href="#">315</a> ; <a href="#">316</a> ; <a href="#">317</a> ; <a href="#">318</a> ; <a href="#">319</a>
121	R.W. Fisher	Amesbury Town Council	863233	Amesbury	MT(S)	<a href="#">322</a> ; <a href="#">323</a> ; <a href="#">324</a>
122	Dr Richard Pagett		389605	Purton	LV(N)	<a href="#">328</a>
123	Philip Clark		424159	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">329</a>
124	Mark Donovan		863767	Sutton Veny	LV(W)	<a href="#">333</a>
125	Heather Abernethie	Warminster Town Council	427919	Warminster	MT(W)	<a href="#">334</a>
126	Steve Wylie	Purton Parish Council	840846	Purton	LV(N)	<a href="#">336</a>
127	Barry Woodcock	BCW Developments	449495	Tisbury	LSC(S)	<a href="#">338</a> ; <a href="#">339</a> ; <a href="#">340</a> ; <a href="#">341</a>
128	Neville Burne		894625	Sherston	LV(N)	<a href="#">342</a>
129	Richard Price			Aldbourne	LV(E)	<a href="#">345</a>
130	Roger Hicklin			Ramsbury	LV(S)	<a href="#">346</a>
131	Richard & Andy Harlow	Harlow & Sons		Atworth	LV(W)	<a href="#">347</a>
132	Simon Chambers	LPC Trull Ltd		"General"		<a href="#">348</a>
133	Mark Reynolds	Professional Planning Services	962627	Sutton Veny	LV (W)	<a href="#">349</a>
134	Robert Quartley	Quartley Surveyors	538353	Westbury	MT (W)	<a href="#">350</a>
135	Mr David Langton		906566	Ramsbury	LV (N)	<a href="#">351</a>
136	Mr Russell Evans		1008849	Shaw	LV (W)	<a href="#">352</a>

**Appendix B – Schedule of comments**

<b>Comment ID:</b>	1	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Robert  Tallon <b>Chairman</b>  <b>Brokenborough Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 851849	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 1	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Malmesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Add in the areas associated with Dyson and Gleeson which have already passed planning.			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>				

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	2	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Graham Dawkins  <b>Person ID:</b> 852023	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 2	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No as half my garden will be out of the boundary and it states that boundaries will follow existing hedges.			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Not on my property and garden			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Willowbrae	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J5 and J6	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Do not move the existing boundary			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Please explain the reasons why you want to change the existing boundary of my property, when it clearly cuts through my garden and does not conform to the existing hedges.			

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	3	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Michael Cox <b>Person ID:</b> 852283	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 3
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		They appear to confuse two issues - the identification of new building land and redefining existing residential land.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No - see above	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Coloingbourne Ducis	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	SU248541
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	To not adopt the propoed redefiniton of the settlement land		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The proposal apparently changes most of my rear garden from being defined as residential land to agricultural land. This will have a significant effect on the overall value of my property - details of any corresponding financial compensation are missing (residential land has a significantly higher value than a field). The proposal will also potentially and significantly affect what the land can be used for - currently it is garden and this use must continue to be available not only to me but if I should decide to sell the property. Agricultural use only will significantly affect the planning consents I need should I want to build a summerhouse etc. or lay paths.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	4	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  John  Badgery  <b>Person ID:</b> 853816	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 4
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Orcheston Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	

<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>There is a danger of over-complicating the issue of boundaries. We are going to have settlement boundaries, parish council boundaries and boundaries of areas designated for neighbourhood planning. There is a need for a tie-in with Democratic Services so that planning boundaries do not distort the size of electorates in small villages. More than 2 boundaries would be excessive.</p> <p>Local councils will try to draw the green line as close as possible to the built area. This will result in the only development possible being in-fill. In-fill is not economical for developers. Where a council draws a tight boundary they should be invited to indicate where they would locate their share of housing allocated to them according to the Development Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>5</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Mark Maidment <b>Person ID:</b> 854200</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 5</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Whilst defining the village boundaries with the Parish Council is the right thing to do, their views might not necessarily reflect the villagers opinions/requirements and opportunities for development which would enhance the village.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b></p>	<p>Not necesasrily.</p>		

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Chapmanslade	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	5F
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The boundary is extended north of the road to encourage sustainable development in the village.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	A Planning proposal which includes application to the SHLAA database for assessment, under reference 3203 . Anticipated timescale would be Q4 2014/Q1 2015.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	None.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	6	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr David Robertson <b>Hindon Parish Councillor</b>  <b>Hindon Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 854597</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 6</b>

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hindon Neighbourhood Plan Area	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	None
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	None		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes Within Eighteen Months		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	7	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Sam Lloyd <b>Not from a Parish Council</b>  <b>UNKNOWN</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 854893	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 7
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>I am writing to you to inform you that I would like for the whole of my property to be included in the draft settlement boundary plan. I have a plot that is split into two parts by a road running through the middle (Middleton rd). On the north side of the road is a bungalow and garden (thrush green), on the south side is a couple of sheds and brick built garage surrounded by a established hedge row (area shaded red). Currently the north side is included in the draft settlement boundary and the south side isn't. I would like to develop the south side of the road by building a 3 or 4 bedroom house/bungalow that fits the criteria of the government targets and is in keeping with the character of the village. I have spoken to the local parish council who have informally said that they have no objections to the site, I have also consulted a local architect who has built many houses in the village. I understand by way of policy that cartilages of properties are being excluded, I hope that as there is already a road that splits my property into two that this policy will not exclude my property from the draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>Below is a copy of my title plan showing thrush green on the north side of Middleton road (surrounded by blue), the plot that I would like include in the draft settlement boundary on the south side (shaded red) and a screen shot of J5 of the draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>Please give me a call or email anytime to discuss and let me know your thoughts.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft</b>			

<b>settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Salisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3079725 (Two maps)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	8	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr John Gateley <b>Savills</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 449160	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 8
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b>			

<p>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</p>			
<p>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</p>			
<p>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</p>		<p>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</p>	
<p>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</p>			
<p>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</p>	<p>1. Scope and reach of this consultation</p> <p>We fully accept that Parish and Town Councils are a key part of the DPD process. However to limit the present consultation process only to these bodies is contrary to the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and Local Development Scheme (LDS). Paragraphs 2.4-2.6 of the SCI lists a range of organisations and stakeholders which should be involved in DPD production, including Parish and Town Councils but also landowners, developers, and other public sector bodies – along with the general public. Likewise in the adopted LDS, on page 29, which sets out the process for this DPD, there is no reference to any phase of consultation resembling the current one. It is essential that all parties are provided with the opportunity to influence the DPD process, to ensure that it duly takes account of all relevant issues and representations. With the current phase of preparation being influenced by only one set of stakeholders out of many, there is an significant risk to the soundness and defensibility of the DPD.</p> <p>2. Scale of proposed changes to boundaries</p> <p>In most cases the maps produced as part of this consultation make only minor additions to policy boundaries – and in many cases land is actually proposed to be removed from the boundary. The effect of this will be to offer negligible scope to deliver new housing to fulfil the NPPF and Core Strategy development targets. This is particularly apparent in the Large Villages and Local Service Centres where there is very little previously-developed land, and where no 'Strategic Allocations' are made through the Core Strategy. Where additions are proposed to village boundaries the majority of plots appear to be already developed - or comprise garden land which paragraph 48 of the NPPF indicates should not count towards supply. In addition, very few examples are apparent that could even theoretically accommodate</p>		

more than 1-2 units – in which case (under draft Core Strategy policy 43), no affordable housing would be provided.

3. Relationship with the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

It is clear that the current consultation has little or no regard to the SHLAA, which is a key mechanism to identify suitable candidate sites for boundary review. It would have been of great value to the process if (for example) the positions of SHLAA sites were identified on maps with an indication of their relationship to the existing boundaries, along with an overview of their potential capacity, deliverability and suitability, corresponding to the council's own published evidence base which has been assembled over many years.

4. Absence of information

The maps circulated as part of this exercise contain no information whatsoever concerning planning and environmental constraints. In considering where housing should be delivered it would be common practice to consider ecological constraints (SSSIs, SACs, SPAs etc), heritage constraints (Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments etc), landscape designations such as AONB, flood risk, and other factors. Without such information, the validity and relevance of any feedback on the location of boundaries will be severely undermined – with respondents being unaware of which areas are less or more constrained for a whole range of reasons.

5. Disregarding of constraints and other errors

Relating to the previous point, the published maps themselves appear to have been revised without regard to environmental constraints and other factors, bringing land into the boundary in entirely misguided locations, for example:

large areas of Coombe Bissett that are within Flood Zone 3 (see west of the A354 close to the River Ebble, grid ref 410811,126532); areas in Broad Chalke that are under the designation Areas of High Ecological Value within the Salisbury District Local Plan (see grid ref 403823,125547); in the Morgan's Vale map, land is drawn into the boundary that appears to be beyond the boundary with the New Forest National Park Authority (see grid ref 419956,120163).

The above issues suggest that the newly-published maps are an inappropriate basis for the review.

6. Housing Restraint Areas (HRAs)

It is noticeable from the newly-published maps that HRAs from the Salisbury District Local Plan are proposed to be harmonised with the new boundaries. In various settlements this has the effect of making the new boundary appear far larger than the existing, with the implication that there is capacity for development and growth in these areas. However, HRAs were originally established on the basis that new development should be very limited, with paragraph 4.47 of the Salisbury District Local Plan stating that (in large gardens) 'the intensification of development would be detrimental to the established character', and that (in other instances) 'additional development in these gaps would adversely change the character of the settlement'. As such, policy H19 of the Local Plan sought to limit infill within HRAs to extensions, subdivisions, and single new dwellings. Hence new dwellings in former HRAs are likely to be acceptable only in isolated cases, a factor which should be borne in mind in the current review.

7. Relationship with Neighbourhood Plans and 'duty to co-operate'

From the consultation leaflet it is quite unclear how Neighbourhood Plans relate to the Allocations DPD and indeed the leaflet itself requests

		<p>'help' to 'understand the relationship between the two processes'. This confusion undermines confidence both in the Allocations DPD and Neighbourhood Planning process, which is concerning given how urgent it now is to plan for new housing development. Wiltshire Council must urgently clarify its intentions on this matter, in the interests of all concerned. It should also clarify how it intends to co-operate with neighbouring authorities and parish/town councils, given that functional relationships transcend county boundaries.</p> <p>8. Timescales From the leaflet circulated as part of this new consultation, it is clear the timetable for preparing this DPD is significantly delayed when compared with the current approved LDS , with submission delayed from July 2014 to April 2015, and adoption from July 2015 to December 2015. In the context of the NPPF which requires authorities to 'boost significantly' the supply of housing' this is quite unsatisfactory. Likewise it fails to respond in a timely manner to the Inspector's 10 th procedural letter on the Wiltshire Core Strategy, in which he made clear that old-style boundaries are not up-to-date.</p> <p>In conclusion whilst we accept and encourage the review of settlement boundaries, the current process is flawed in a number of important respects, undermining the future soundness and defensibility of this DPD. Since the consultation has already begun it is rather too late for many of the above issues to be remedied. However at the very least we would request that this consultation is widened to the full range of stakeholders identified in the SCI with an appropriate extension to the closing date, to enable representation and feedback to be duly made.</p>	
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>9</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  G  Godwin <b>Pegasus Planning Group</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390736</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 9</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b></p>			

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		I appreciate that developers/agents are not invited to comment at this stage. However, I note that the draft boundaries are intended to include land subject of planning permissions and would draw your attention to the exclusion of the land subject of a resolution to grant planning permission at Burbage – Council Ref 13/06529/OUT	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	10	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Paul J <b>Person ID:</b> 855231	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 10
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>		No. The exclusion of properties with “large residential gardens” significantly disadvantages property owners on the perimeter of the	

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>boundary, automatically excluding them from the opportunity to apply for planning permission e.g. for extensions or modifications to their property. It will significantly devalue their properties, due to both the inability to modify the property and the change in classification of the land from residential to agricultural. In addition, the application of the criteria is inconsistent and seemingly arbitrarily applied to the proposed boundaries. Some properties retain their gardens whilst others do not. Finally, the criteria of "large residential garden" is unspecified and therefore subjective.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No. They have been inconsistently applied (see answer to question 1).</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Burbage</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>K9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Boundary should remain as it currently exists.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In agreement with Mr Graham Dawkins response: "Please explain the reasons why you want to change the existing boundary of my property, when it clearly cuts through my garden and does not conform to the existing hedges."  Similar to Mr Michael Cox's response: The proposal changes ALL of my rear garden from residential land to agricultural land. This will have a significant effect on the overall value of my property – I too would expect financial compensation for this. The proposal will also significantly effect what the land can be used for – currently it is garden and this use must continue to be available, not only to me but also if I decide to sell the property in the future. "Agricultural use only" will significantly effect the planning consents I need should I wish to build a summerhouse etc.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b></p>			

answers			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	11	<b>Consultee:</b> Frank Hughes & Jehanne Le Quesne <b>Person ID:</b> 438019	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 11
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		<p>We are the owners of 'Greenlands' (formerly 'Glenroy'), Stanton Lane, Kington St Michael, SN14 6JQ. Following our phone conversation with Daniel Wilson on 22 August, we are writing to request that the proposed settlement boundary in Kington St Michael be adjusted to include the northern section of our garden. Both the present and the proposed boundary runs a few feet from our kitchen window and cuts our garden in half.</p> <p>Our house is a small, unmodernised bungalow of concrete block construction, dating from the mid 1950s and not adequate by today's standards. We would like to demolish it and put two ecologically-friendly dwellings on the site, sharing the existing entrance. Our immediate neighbours in The Orchard have been consulted by us and have raised no objections. We raised this idea at a meeting of Kington St Michael Parish Council (27 March 2014), who also gave us their support.</p> <p>If the idea for two dwellings is not allowed, we would like to consider rebuilding or modernising our present bungalow. The most logical way to extend (and also the least obtrusive for neighbours) would be to extend to the north of the site and to replace the present east-west axis with a north-south axis - ie making the building facing onto Stanton Lane instead of sitting at right angles to it, as it does at present. The present and proposed boundary confines any new building to the south of the site, which is much nearer to neighbouring houses.</p> <p>We note that in the Draft Methodology for Consultation, it says: "Where practical, the draft settlement</p>	

		<p>boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement." It seems clear that the natural boundary to the village is where the northern boundary of our garden meets the open fields, where there is both a hedgerow and a ditch. On the north-eastern side, the garden is bordered by an ancient native hedgerow, below which is a sharp drop onto Stanton Lane.</p> <p>We have tried, without success, over the years, to find out the original reason for this boundary ruling. We would also mention that there is a precedent in Kington St Michael for adjusting the settlement boundary, when the farmyard at Manor Farm was developed for housing, which became 'Skillins'.</p>	
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p>Kington St Michael</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>12</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Mark  Simpson <b>DPDS Consulting</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 12</b></p>

	<p><b>Person ID:</b> 556073</p>		
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Regarding: Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD; Wiltshire Settlement Boundary Review Informal Consultation and Wiltshire SHLAA – Opposition to development of land at Broughton Gifford, Melksham SN12 8PH</p> <p>As suggested during a telephone call to the Spatial Planning team, I write on behalf of my client with respect to prospective development land located between 113 and 113A the Street, Broughton Gifford, near Melksham SN12 8PH, which we understand is being promoted by a developer. I attach a location plan for this site along with a cover letter, a summary sheet and a preliminary assessment of the prospective development site that we request be considered by Council in the preparation of the above forward planing documents.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Melksham</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b></p>			

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3096557 (x3 Covering letter, background study and SHLAA form)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	13	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Will  Templer  <b>Person ID:</b> 856196	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 13
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		I live at Little Halse in Sutton Veny, postcode BA12 7AT and I have just been informed of the proposed changes to the village boundaries and on inspection of the maps have discovered that the new proposed boundary bisects my property completely. I have lived here for over 10 years and would like to object to the proposed boundary immediately.  Please will you confirm you have received my objection?  Can you also tell me how else I can ensure that this doesn't occur please?	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>	Sutton Veny	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>	

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	14	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Michael Perry <b>Chair</b>  <b>Bishopstrow Parish Meeting</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 709291	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 14
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The people of Bishopstrow believe that they are separate community from Warminster and we are very concerned by any proposals that would lead to the separation of the village from the town being eroded	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b>		We do agree that the draft settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with the criteria Warminster is the local service town for Bishopstrow and provides the infrastructure (primary/secondary schools, doctors surgeries etc) not	

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	available in a small village. We therefore believe that a single large housing and associated infrastructure development concentrated in the west urban extension provides the is the most sustainable development path to allow our rsidents the access to the services they require.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Bishopstrow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Warminster is our local service town. Bishopstrow Parish tried to become involved in the Neighbourhood Plan for Warminster and were refused because Bishopstrow is not part of Warminster Parish. However, although Warminster Town Council refused to allow Bishopstrow Parish an active part in its Neighbourhood Plan we are watching its development with interest and intend to take an active part when it is available for comment.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	We believe that sufficient housing land has been allocated to meet the needs of Warminster and that allocating additional land within the settlement boundary would encourage speculative development without the supporting infrastructure. This needs to be resisted very firmly.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	15	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Gary Brain <b>Member</b>  <b>Colerne Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 856295</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 15</b>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Colerne</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The attached are the proposed boundaries from the Colerne Parish Council.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3097929 (Two maps)</p>		

<b>Comment ID:</b>	16	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 16	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		✓		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F3/ 4,G/H 4 and H/I 4/5	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The Parish Council supports these three amendmens but only because they are correcting an old mapping error. The parish Council would not support any further development north-east of Marsh Road.			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>		No		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	18	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 18
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K/L 7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The Parish Council accepts this amendment.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>		No	

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	19	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 19
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> L 8 (Old Rectory area)

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The Boundaries should be redrawn to include residential properties only, but excluding garages and gardens, which should be left outside the VPL, as indicated by the suggested line being shown in red on the map.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	20	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 20
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>		Yes	

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 9 (Square)
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3103714		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	21	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 21
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	√		

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 9, M 9, N 9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable and logical.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3103714		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	22	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 392128</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 22</b>

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	√		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	0 8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This should be redrawn more tightly to the houses, and the rectangle should be left out, i.e. the eastern end should be redrawn closer to the houses, as indicated by the suggested line being shown in red.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>	3103714		

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	23	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 23
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	O 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	24	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 24
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	N 10 (Southfield, West Wing)
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The boundaries should be redrawn tighter to the houses rather than the large gardens being included in the proposed revision, as indicated by the suggested line shown in red.		

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3103714</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>25</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Marylyn  Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 25</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>√</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b></p>	<p>Hilperton Parish</p>		

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	M 10
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?		The new line east of the existing boundary is not supported but the changes in the south-east corner are (as indicated on the map).	
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?		No	
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?		No	
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers		3103714	
Comment ID:	26	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 26
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?		√	
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the		No	

<b>critterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> L 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The existing boundary should be retained so it is tight to the two houses and excludes the gardens. The boundary line to 3 Stonelea should be redrawn as indicated on the map. The Parish Council accepts the new green line to the Lion and Fiddle car park.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	27	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 27
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>		√	

<b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The existing boundary should be retained so it is tight to the two houses and excludes the gardens. The boundary line to 3 Stonelea should be redrawn as indicated on the map. The Parish Council accepts the new green line to the Lion and Fiddle car park.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	28	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 28</b>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 392128	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	√		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K 9 and K 10 - Green Square
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Might this be a topographical error? The revision goes in more tightly and is supported.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>	3103714		

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	29	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 29
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K 8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	30	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 30
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K 7 (school area)
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable.		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	31	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 31
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Hilperton Parish	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	K 8
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?		Revision as shown is acceptable.	
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?		No	
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?		No	
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers		3103714	
Comment ID:	32	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 32
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?		√	
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the		No	

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> H 6 and I 6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Back of Horse Road. Should stay as original because of the gardens, as indicated on the map.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	33	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 33
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>		√	

<b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H 6 and H 7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Continue the green straight across, as indicated in red.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	34	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 34</b>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 392128	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	√		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G 6 and G 7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revision as shown is acceptable		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>	3103714		

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	35	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 35
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	E 5 and F 5 and 4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Revisions as shown are acceptable.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3103714	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	36	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Marylyn Timms <b>Hilperton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 392128	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 36
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hilperton Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	M 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The new line east of the existing boundary is not supported but the changes in the south-east corner are (as indicated on the map).		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3099853	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	37	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Robert Leonard <b>Person ID:</b> 856337	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 37
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Not in all cases, a more consistent approach is required with how close the boundary is drawn to the rear of houses.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		Steeple Ashton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The boundary should be applied evenly in its distance from the rear of houses, say 5m from the main rear wall. For example, houses on home farm have no reduction in their rear gardens, whereas my house and that of Church Farm have the new boundary almost touching the boardwalk.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		n/a	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Is the cost and effort worthwhile?	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	38	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Richard Cosker <b>DIRECTOR</b>  <b>RCC Town Planning Consultancy Ltd</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 856708	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 38
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		It is noted that that developers/agents are not invited to comment at this stage (and I would raise concerns about the acceptability of this form of restricted consultation) however, the documentation states that the draft boundaries are intended to include land subject of planning permissions. As such I would draw your attention to the exclusion of the land at Quemerford Calne. The land in question is subject to a resolution to grant outline planning permission (under delegated powers) subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement and details of that proposal can be found under application reference 13/04855/OUT.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b>			

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	39	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Kevin Watson <b>CHRISTIAN MALFORD PARISH COUNCIL</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 479874	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 39
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>		This appears to be an appropriate criterion.	

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>WCC should consider the approach taken in this process in that changes are being proposed to existing properties without publicising this to impacted residents.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>For Christian Malford the majority of the proposed changes appear to be consistent with the criterion. As detailed in Section C there are areas of the proposal that are not understood in relation to the criterion.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>CHRISTIAN MALFORD PARISH</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H7</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Please confirm why the boundary is being extended for this area? It is difficult to be certain from the map but appears to be expanding the development area for the school.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Christian Malford is developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The current project plan is geared towards a final referendum in June 2015. As a significant amount of the remaining project work requires the involvement of statutory bodies and is beyond the team's control it is possible that the timetable may need to be extended. The current phase of the project will identify needs and preferences on future housing and will be a key enabler in developing proposed changes to the settlement boundary. This should become evident in Q1 2015. Separate activity by WCC in this time period will be unwelcome as it could undermine the approach taken by the NDP team.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Whilst the need to standardise definition of settlement boundaries across Wiltshire is understood, the impact of the proposed changes appears minimal. WCC are requested to engage with Christian Malford Parish Council and the NDP team before embarking on any further expansion/changes to the settlement boundaries. Considerable work has already been completed in identifying needs and preferences for any future development and it would be inappropriate for WCC to develop and publish proposals in isolation. The local process is at a critical stage and intervention by WCC could undermine the entire NDP programme. It would be extremely helpful for WCC to publish current thinking in terms of the criteria that will be used for the next phase of settlement boundary definition and expansion. This will be a considerable help to the Neighbourhood Development Plan team and avoid wasted or duplicated effort going forward.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you</b></p>			

<b>have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	40	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Kevin Watson <b>CHRISTIAN MALFORD PARISH COUNCIL</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 479874	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 40
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		This appears to be an appropriate criterion. WCC should consider the approach taken in this process in that changes are being proposed to existing properties without publicising this to impacted residents.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		For Christian Malford the majority of the proposed changes appear to be consistent with the criterion. As detailed in Section C there are areas of the proposal that are not understood in relation to the criterion.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	CHRISTIAN MALFORD PARISH	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Why has the boundary been contracted for this area?		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>	Christian Malford is developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The current project plan is geared towards a final referendum in June 2015. As a significant amount of the remaining project work requires the involvement of statutory bodies and is beyond the team's control it is possible that the timetable may need to be extended. The current phase of the project will identify needs and preferences on future housing and will be a key enabler in developing proposed		

<p><b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>changes to the settlement boundary. This should become evident in Q1 2015. Separate activity by WCC in this time period will be unwelcome as it could undermine the approach taken by the NDP team.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Whilst the need to standardise definition of settlement boundaries across Wiltshire is understood, the impact of the proposed changes appears minimal. WCC are requested to engage with Christian Malford Parish Council and the NDP team before embarking on any further expansion/changes to the settlement boundaries. Considerable work has already been completed in identifying needs and preferences for any future development and it would be inappropriate for WCC to develop and publish proposals in isolation. The local process is at a critical stage and intervention by WCC could undermine the entire NDP programme. It would be extremely helpful for WCC to publish current thinking in terms of the criteria that will be used for the next phase of settlement boundary definition and expansion. This will be a considerable help to the Neighbourhood Development Plan team and avoid wasted or duplicated effort going forward.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>41</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Louis  Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b>  <b>Codford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857248</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 41</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The criterion for the settlement boundary review appear to be appropriate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b></p>	<p>No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in both the areas which have been included and those excluded when applying the stated criterion e.g.definition of large gardens.</p>		

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Codford Parish Council	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	16.9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This particular site is highlighted to support the point made at Question 2. The proposed boundary splits the garden in two to exclude an existing garage/shed/office. It is suggested that the whole garden should be included in the settlement.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	42	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Louis Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b>  <b>Codford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857248</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 42</b>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The criterion for the settlement boundary review appear to be appropriate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in both the areas which have been included and those excluded when applying the stated criterion e.g. definition of large gardens.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Codford Parish Council</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H 7.3</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This site is identified to support the point made at Question 2. In this case the proposed boundary change has extended the rear garden to convert it into what could be described as "a large garden". No change of boundary is recommended.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	43	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Maria  Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 500702	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 43
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Rectangle is a field and should be excluded. Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens. Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature). Square is school playing field and should be excluded. Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens. Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>	No.		

<b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Not at present.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	44	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Maria Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 500702	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 44
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b> H7

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		There is a property currently being built on part of the land that you have excluded (13/02577/FUL). This should be included. However the neighbour's garden should remain excluded. There is a small area in the Church Yard where the existing boundary should remain.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Not at present.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	45	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Maria Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 500702	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 45
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b>		Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.	

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Section of rectangle currently has a property being built on it (14/05240/FUL). This should be included. However the neighbour's garden should remain excluded.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Not at present.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	46	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Maria Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 500702</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 46</b>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Whiteparish</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>14</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>2 houses with large gardens – why have you not moved the boundary to comply with curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement? This includes large residential gardens.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Not at present.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	47	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Maria  Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 500702	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 47
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Why has this rectangular strip been added? Move back to original boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No.		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Not at present.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	48	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Maria  Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 500702</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 48</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G6
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	This is The Fountain Public House car park and should be excluded. Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built		

proposed change?	form of the settlement.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Not at present.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	49	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Maria Pennington <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Whiteparish Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 500702</p> <p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 49</p>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Not always – these are specified in 3, Part C.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>	Yes	

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Whiteparish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	E7 and F7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Small rectangle which falls under isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement including farm buildings or agricultural buildings. This should be excluded.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Not at present.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	50	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857754</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 50</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary.		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.          The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .          However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.          Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.          In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.          In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G3,F3,G4,G5,H5,H8,I6,I8,J6,7,8,9, I7 and K9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Please see attached.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for</p>		

to the boundary review?	additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3111396 (PDF of comments)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	51	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>West Lavington Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 857754</p> <p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 51</p>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported . However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well</p>	

	established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	West Lavington and Littleton Panell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G3
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This is the largest change and introduces a significant extension to the boundary. It includes A'Beckett's House and four other houses ( one of which is a recent replacement dwelling ). However, this is no different from the previous situation. More significantly it includes the substantial garden of A'Becketts ( probably well in excess of 2 acres ) running parallel to the High Street which still makes an appreciable gap between the next houses on the High Street. This open ground would therefore be automatically included within the built up area. Since in general large country house gardens have not been included within the boundary and there has been no recent changes in this area this proposal is not seen to be necessary or desirable. The inclusion of this land at present would represent a change in status which could precipitate an immediate planning application which would be better considered within the Neighbourhood Plan. For this reason, and without prejudice to any possible Plan proposals, this projected change is therefore not supported .		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. First draft winter 2014.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3111396 (PDF of comments)		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	52	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 52</b>

		<p><b>West Lavington Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID: 857754</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .</p> <p>However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>F3</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This proposal is to include a significant piece of land surrounding a large freestanding house between the High Street and Pagnell Lane. The land proposed is only the immediate surroundings to the house which stands in much larger grounds ( several acres ). As such the</p>		

	<p>boundary does not appear to have any clear definition on the ground. This proposal appears unnecessary. There has been no change and this house ( Edwardian era ) clearly stands as an independent property in its grounds. There are many other similar substantial properties with grounds close the edge of the village and none of them have ever been included within the boundary. This proposal therefore appears inconsistent with other aspects of the boundary and is not supported.</p> <p>A second proposal in this area seeks to tighten the boundary on the edge of the garden on the west side of Pagnell Lane. It appears to cut across the garden and exclude part of the plot from the settlement. This appears inconsistent with the principal criterion and without reason and is not supported .</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3111396 (PDF of comments)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>53</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857754</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 53</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct</b></p>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the</p>		

<p>ones?</p>	<p>forthcoming development.                  The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .                  However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.                  Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.                  In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.                  In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G4</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This proposal seeks to draw a line across the rear gardens of about three houses on the east side of the High Street. There appears to be no purpose to this and it contradicts the principal criterion and is therefore not supported .</p> <p>A separate G4 proposal is to extend the boundary to incorporate 2 houses on the eastern edge, one of which has recently been rebuilt on a larger scale. The proposal follows the plot boundary and updates the position and is therefore recommended.</p> <p>A third G4 proposal affects a small plot to the west of the High Street where a new line is shown deviating from the footpath alignment into a less developed garden plot. Again this appears inconsistent with the principal criterion and is not necessary and not supported .</p>		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Yes. First draft winter 2014.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3111396	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	54	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857754</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 54</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .</p> <p>However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council's attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p>	

	<p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council's attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G5</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This proposal is to extend the boundary to go all around the edge of the house plots that have been developed to the rear of Littleton Farm. This updates the situation, follows the plot boundary and therefore the principal criterion. ( This change is in marked contrast to other areas where the boundary has been proposed to cut across gardens. ) There is also further tidying up of the boundary in both the top left and bottom right hand corners of G5/G6 which again follow the footpath. All of these changes are therefore recommended.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3111396 (PDF of comments)</p>		

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>55</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857754</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 55</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development. The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported . However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow. Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies. In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies. In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		

<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	West Lavington and Littleton Panell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This proposal seeks to draw the boundary more tightly on land to the rear of houses on the east of the High Street again cutting across some rear gardens and ruling out an adjacent larger area. Part of this area has previously been registered as a SHLAA site although gaining access has proved difficult. As a SHLAA site it is under consideration within the Neighbourhood Plan to determine if it could provide useful infill potential for increasing the housing stock in the village. It is therefore a matter of concern that a possible change in status could trigger an immediate planning application that would be better considered within the context of the proposals for the Neighbourhood Plan. For this reason, and without prejudice to the possible Plan proposals, this projected change is not supported.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. First draft winter 2014.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3111396 (PDF of comments)		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	56	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857754</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 56</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary.		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.                  The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .                  However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.                  Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.                  In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.                  In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This proposal amends the boundary to reflect the approved development of new buildings within the Dauntsey’s complex adjacent to the playing fields. As such it updates the boundary and complies with the criterion and is therefore recommended.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for</p>		

to the boundary review?	additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3111396 (PDF of comments)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	57	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>West Lavington Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 857754</p> <p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 57</p>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported . However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well</p>	

	established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	West Lavington and Littleton Panell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This proposal affects about 6 houses on the north side of Lavington Lane and seeks to draw the boundary line through the middle of their gardens. The gardens are not particularly long, the proposal conflicts with the Council's own principal criterion and appears to have no real purpose. The proposal is not supported.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. First draft winter 2014.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3111396 (PDF of comments)		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	58	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857754</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 58</b>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .</p> <p>However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>18</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>This proposal affects 3 houses on the north side of Sunnyside which back onto Dauntsey’s playing fields. It seeks to take the boundary across the middle of their gardens, which are not particularly long. This is similar to the Lavington Lane proposals and has no purpose and is in conflict with the principal criterion. The proposal is not supported.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		

<b>timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3111396 (PDF of comments)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	59	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>West Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857754</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 59</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>The principal criterion is fully supported . It is felt that it is essential, from the viewpoint of clarity at a local level, for people to be able to identify a precise line where the boundary runs by means of a physical feature on the ground. The absence of this could lead to difficulties in people and the Parish Council interpreting proposals for new development that are adjacent to the proposed boundary. All qualifying points to include areas with permission for development are also supported since this is, in effect, a recognition of the forthcoming development.</p> <p>The qualifying point to exclude areas of isolated development is supported .</p> <p>However, those qualifying points which relate to the exclusion of open land at the edge of the settlement are not supported . They are not felt to be appropriate since they have been applied in an unrealistic and unduly constraining manner which cuts features – thus conflicting with the principal criterion. This will be seen in the detailed comments which follow.</p> <p>Thus whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council's attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number of serious inconsistencies.</p> <p>In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b>		No - whilst the principal criterion is strongly supported, Wiltshire Council's attention is drawn to the fact that they have significantly failed to adhere to this criterion in the consultation proposals for the West Lavington and Littleton Panell boundary and this has resulted in a number	

<p><b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>of serious inconsistencies. In general the effect of the changes has been to tighten the line in many places, not all of which have clear lines on the ground, but in some instances additional land has been included for no obvious reason. It is also a matter of concern that possible changes to the well established boundary at this time should not prejudice the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which will shortly be producing documents with development proposals.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>J6,7,8,9, I7 and K9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>All these proposals represent minor tidying up amendments to the boundary which appear to conform with the principal criterion and the current situation and are therefore recommended.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. First draft winter 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>That Wiltshire Council be requested to acknowledge that any settlement boundaries adopted by it (as a result of the informal consultation in relation to the Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries) may be subject to further extension or amendment to provide for additional housing needs identified as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3111396 (PDF of comments)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>60</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Lance Allan <b>Town Clerk</b> <b>Trowbridge Town Council</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 60</b></p>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 391073	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Trowbridge Town Council agrees that the criteria are correct.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Trowbridge Town Council agrees that the proposed settlement boundary for Trowbridge have been drawn in accordance with the criteria.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Trowbridge.	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	ST 844 562
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Trowbridge Town Council supports the inclusion of the site bounded to the south by the stream, to the West by frome Rd, to the North by Old Brick Fields and to the East by Spring Meadows and which is being promoted by Newland Homes.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Trowbridge Town Council is not considering a Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The Town Council also notes the inclusion within the settlement boundary of the remaining land to the South of Green Lane which has not so far been included as part of the strategic site and the Town Council supports the inclusion of this area.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	61	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857749	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 61
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	Various
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill: H11, I11 & I12: The Spa The Council feel this should remain OUTSIDE of the Settlement Boundary as it did in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 1 st Alteration 2004. As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the		

	<p>boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.</p> <p>B13, C13, D11, D12, D13, D14, E11, E12: Berryfield The Council feel that Berryfield should not be considered as a small village and be included in this Settlement Boundary Review. Berryfield is bigger than North Bradley for example, which is being considered under this review. There is a lot of development planned for Berryfield with the Melksham Link canal project and associated development, as well as a current planning application for 170 dwellings (W/14/07526).</p> <p>D11, E11, E11,E12: Mobile Home Park, Berryfield The boundary used to follow a clear physical feature here, the A350, but there is a now a 'finger' drawn encompassing the Mobile Home Park, this does not follow a clear physical feature.</p> <p>3B: Shurnhold offices/George Ward school site The boundary has been moved to NOT include this site which now has outlying planning consent and an application for demolition; why would the boundary move now to not include a site that has planning consent?</p> <p>7C: Sewage sites The Parish Council do not understand why the Melksham Treatment Works has not been included within the settlement boundary of the Town when the adjacent Countrywide and Asda sites are included. The Sewage Works could not be considered as undeveloped countryside.</p> <p>B3 &amp; C3: Dunch Lane &amp; G6 As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.</p> <p>D 13, 14, 15, 16 – K13, 14, 15, 16: Bowerhill Industrial and Residential areas The Council has concerns that the Village of Bowerhill does not have a delineation between the Industrial and Residential areas.</p>
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes, in the next 18 months.</p>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b></p>	

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	62	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857749	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 62
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H11, I11 & I12: The Spa
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The Council feel this should remain OUTSIDE of the Settlement Boundary as it did in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 1 st Alteration 2004. As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.		

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes, in the next 18 months.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>63</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857749</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 63</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.</p>		

<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> B13, C13, D11, D12, D13, D14, E11, E12: Berryfield
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		B13, C13, D11, D12, D13, D14, E11, E12: Berryfield The Council feel that Berryfield should not be considered as a small village and be included in this Settlement Boundary Review. Berryfield is bigger than North Bradley for example, which is being considered under this review. There is a lot of development planned for Berryfield with the Melksham Link canal project and associated development, as well as a current planning application for 170 dwellings (W/14/07526).	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Yes, in the next 18 months.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	64	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857749</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 64</b>

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement .                  The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature.                  The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	<p>Yes</p>		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	<p>Melksham &amp; Bowerhill</p>	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	<p>D11, E11, E11,E12: Mobile Home Park, Berryfield</p>
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>D11, E11, E11,E12: Mobile Home Park, Berryfield                  The boundary used to follow a clear physical feature here, the A350, but there is a now a 'finger' drawn encompassing the Mobile Home Park, this does not follow a clear physical feature.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	<p>Yes, in the next 18 months.</p>		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>	<p>No</p>		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	65	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857749</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 65</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	3B: Shurnhold offices/George Ward school site

<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3B: Shurnhold offices/George Ward school site The boundary has been moved to NOT include this site which now has outlying planning consent and an application for demolition; why would the boundary move now to not include a site that has planning consent?</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes, in the next 18 months.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>66</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857749</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 66</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for</p>		

		development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	7C: Sewage sites
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	7C: Sewage sites The Parish Council do not understand why the Melksham Treatment Works has not been included within the settlement boundary of the Town when the adjacent Countrywide and Asda sites are included. The Sewage Works could not be considered as undeveloped countryside.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes, in the next 18 months.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	67	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 67</b>

		<b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 857749</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement .</p> <p>The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature.</p> <p>The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	B3 & C3: Dunch Lane & G6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>B3 &amp; C3: Dunch Lane &amp; G6</p> <p>As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes, in the next 18 months.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	68	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Teresa Strange <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857749	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 68
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement . The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature. The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham & Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	D 13, 14, 15, 16 – K13, 14, 15, 16: Bowerhill Industrial and Residential areas
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>			

<b>proposed change?</b>	D 13, 14, 15, 16 – K13, 14, 15, 16: Bowerhill Industrial and Residential areas The Council has concerns that the Village of Bowerhill does not have a delineation between the Industrial and Residential areas.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes, in the next 18 months.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	69	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Arnall  <b>Person ID:</b> 391369	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 69
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Good afternoon After speaking to a very helpful lady on the telephone today, please accept this e-mail with the details relating to a request for a change in the proposed settlement boundary for Corsham. We have tried to show the area concerned on a series of maps (please see attached files) We hope this is sufficient for the request to be considered. If I can be of any further assistance or you require further detail, Please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you and regards, Peter Arnall		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>			

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Change to proposed Draft settlement boundary for Corsham. The area is known as Halfway Firs, Corsham, Wiltshire. SN13 0PJ We have outlined the proposed area for inclusion in red within the red oval relating to the full map location	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		Corsham Boundary Map 1 Corsham Boundary Map 2 Corsham Boundary Map 3	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	70	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Arnall  <b>Person ID:</b> 391369	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 70
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct</b>		Good afternoon  After speaking to a very helpful lady on the telephone today, please accept this e-mail with the details relating to a request for a change in the proposed settlement boundary for Corsham.	

<p>ones?</p>	<p>We have tried to show the area concerned on a series of maps (please see attached files)</p> <p>We hope this is sufficient for the request to be considered</p> <p>If I can be of any further assistance or you require further detail, Please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you and regards,</p> <p>Peter Arnall</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b></p>	<p>3111716</p> <p>Corsham Boundary Map 1</p> <p>Corsham Boundary Map 2</p>		

<b>answers</b>		Corsham Boundary Map 3	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	71	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Arnall  <b>Person ID:</b> 391369	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 71
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>After speaking to a very helpful lady on the telephone today, please accept this e-mail with the details relating to a request for a change in the proposed settlement boundary for Corsham.</p> <p>We have tried to show the area concerned on a series of maps (please see attached files)</p> <p>We hope this is sufficient for the request to be considered</p> <p>If I can be of any further assistance or you require further detail, Please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you and regards,</p> <p>Peter Arnall</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>			

<b>proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3111720 Corsham Boundary Map 1 Corsham Boundary Map 2 Corsham Boundary Map 3	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	72	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Arnall <b>Person ID:</b> 391369	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 72
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>After speaking to a very helpful lady on the telephone today, please accept this e-mail with the details relating to a request for a change in the proposed settlement boundary for Corsham.</p> <p>We have tried to show the area concerned on a series of maps (please see attached files)</p> <p>We hope this is sufficient for the request to be considered</p> <p>If I can be of any further assistance or you require further detail, Please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you and regards,</p>	

		Peter Arnall	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3111721 Corsham Boundary Map 1 Corsham Boundary Map 2 Corsham Boundary Map 3	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	73	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Jan Urbanski	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 73</b>

	<p><b>Person ID:</b> 857920</p>	
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Absolutely not. The proposed expansion at Victoria Road means that all access to resources are the other side of town and makes it one sided.          That the issues of infrastructure are being completely ignored. Schools, medical, emergency resources, roads, drainage, sewage - None are dealt with to allow this kind of expansion.          The green footprint is set to balloon as there are no employment opportunities in this town so all workers are driving somewhere.          Mr Murrison identified the core issue of creating a "Dormitory Town" - this without employment prospect is exactly that.          If social housing is required then it should be funded without exploiting mass expansion to gain the private developer social housing percentage.          Warminster will not attract business based on its decline in the Town. Without employment prospects and a non-existent police force we are building dormitory settlements where people cannot find work. Is that justified or desired?</p>	
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>All settlement boundary decisions need to be based on infrastructure and employment prospects</p>	
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Warminster</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Consider the town's potential</p>	
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	74	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Louis  Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b>  <b>Codford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 857248</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 74</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The criterion for the settlement boundary review appear to be appropriate.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in the application of the stated criterion to both the areas which have been included and those excluded.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Codford Parish Council	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G/H 5.8
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	The proposed boundary change splits the farm yard and the existing agricultural buildings into two sites. One half on which there are two		

<p><b>proposed change?</b></p>	<p>bungalows is included and the other excluded. It appears inconsistent that the entire site which is physically and functionally related to the settlement should be divided in two parts; one potentially available for development and the other not so. It is recommended that the site should be considered as one entity and as such it should be either included or excluded. The site in its entirety is contiguous to the village settlement and as such the Parish Council considers its inclusion within the settlement boundary to be practical and more consistent to the implementation of the draft criterion.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>75</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Louis  Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b>  <b>Codford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857248</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 75</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The criterion for the settlement boundary review appear to be appropriate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b></p>	<p>No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in the application of the stated criterion to both the areas which have been included and those excluded.e.g. the definition of large gardens.</p>		

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Codford Parish Council	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G 5.5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>Whilst no change in boundary is recommended this particular site is highlighted in this submission together with others elsewhere in this settlement to support the response to Question 2.</p> <p>The proposed boundary change in this case divides the large garden area of the property into two separate plots; one within the draft settlement boundary and the other without. The residual section nevertheless includes a garden of considerable dimensions available for potential development which is inconsistent with other smaller gardens within the settlement which are excluded when applying the draft criterion.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	76	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Louis Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b> <b>Codford Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b> Person ID: 76

		<b>Person ID:</b> 857248	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes. The criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries appear to be appropriate.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in the application of the criterion for both areas which have been included as well as those which have been excluded, as detailed in other examples submitted by this Parish Council.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Codford Parish Council	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F 6.1
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The proposed boundary should be extended to encompass the existing agricultural buildings which are contiguous to the village and are physically and functionally related to the settlement.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	77	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Louis Hoareau <b>Clerk/Finance Officer</b>  <b>Codford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 857248	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 77
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes. The criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries appear to be appropriate.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No. A number of anomalies and inconsistencies are apparent in the application of the criterion in the case of both areas which are included as well as those which have been excluded, especially when considering the definition of "large residential gardens"	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Codford Parish Council	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G 6.5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	This particular grid reference is included as another example to support the response to Question 2. The existing large garden area has been reduced considerably by the application of the draft criterion but the resultant land within the proposed boundary, potentially available for development, can still nevertheless be defined as a large residential garden and as such it is inconsistent with the declared criteria for exclusion.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>	No		

<b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	78	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Veronica Hourihane <b>Clerk</b> <b>Ashton Keynes Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 857971</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 78</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>	

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Ashton Keynes is in the process of producing a Neighbourhood Plan. Early indications show that it wuld not be necessary to review the settlement boundary (as outlined in the proposals) to meet projected housing needs in the area, However, as the neighbourhood plan process progresses, it may identify one or two sites, immediately adjacent to the area enclosed by the proposed settlement boundary, to provide enabling housing development for community facilities.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		No	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	79	<b>Consultee:</b> Nicky Ashton <b>Person ID:</b> 839834	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 79
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b>		Yes	

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Woodfalls and Morgans Vale	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> 5G/H
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		5G/H To remain as a housing restraint area to preserve the rural characteristics in this vicinity.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		NO	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		To maintain the Parish as a rural community which means building needs to be in accordance with the current amenities and highway structure. As it is a rural community there are lanes rather than roads which cannot accommodate housing, parking and modern levels of traffic. There has been recent issues due to new housing being granted in a rural setting resulting in emergency vehicle access being denied due to on road parking.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	80	<b>Consultee:</b> Nicky Ashton <b>Person ID:</b> 839834	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 80
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>		Yes	

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Woodfalls and Morgans Vale	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> 7/8G
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		7/8G Unacceptable maintain existng boundary	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		NO	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		To maintain the Parish as a rural community which means building needs to be in accordance with the current amenities and highway structure. As it is a rural community there are lanes rather than roads which cannot accommodate housing, parking and modern levels of traffic. There has been recent issues due to new housing being granted in a rural setting resulting in emergency vehicle access being denied due to on road parking.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	81	<b>Consultee:</b> Nicky Ashton <b>Person ID:</b> 839834	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 81
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Woodfalls and Morgans Vale	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	8/9H
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	8/9H Unacceptable maintain existing property boundary		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	NO		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	To maintain the Parish as a rural community which means building needs to be in accordance with the current amenities and highway structure. As it is a rural community there are lanes rather than roads which cannot accommodate housing, parking and modern levels of traffic. There has been recent issues due to new housing being granted in a rural setting resulting in emergency vehicle access being denied due to on road parking.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	82	<b>Consultee:</b> Nicky  Ashton  <b>Person ID:</b> 839834	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 82
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	Yes		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Woodfalls and Morgans Vale	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	8I
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	8I This encroaches into New Forest National Park boundary.		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	NO		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	To maintain the Parish as a rural community which means building needs to be in accordance with the current amenities and highway structure. As it is a rural community there are lanes rather than roads which cannot accommodate housing, parking and modern levels of traffic. There has been recent issues due to new housing being granted in a rural setting resulting in emergency vehicle access being denied due to on road parking.		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	83	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Jeff Penfold <b>Malmesbury Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 647682	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 83
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	YES		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	NO but only because they omit some areas		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Malmesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	4 F G H
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	On 10 th July the High Court de facto granted outline planning permission to Gleeson Stratetic Land's application N/11/04126/OUT "Land South of Filands". The settlement boundary needs to accommodate this land.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies a site that impacts the settlement boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at examination stage and anticipated referendum in the autumn. The Town Council's representative on the Neighbourhood Plan has made input to this response.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>	NO		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		Map	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	84	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Jeff Penfold <b>Malmesbury Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 647682	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 84
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		YES	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		NO but only because they omit some areas	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Malmesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	3 & 4 C & D
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	647682Mr Jeff		

		Penfold Malmesbury Town Council84 YESNO but only because they omit some areasYesMalmesbury3 & 4 C & DThe settlement boundary needs to accommodate the Dyson employment land identified in application N/14/02971/OUT for which outline planning permission was granted 9 th June 2014.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies a site that impacts the settlement boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at examination stage and anticipated referendum in the autumn. The Town Council's representative on the Neighbourhood Plan has made input to this response.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		NO	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		Map	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	85	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Jeff Penfold <b>Malmesbury Town Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 647682	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 85
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		YES	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>		NO but only because they omit some areas	

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Malmesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> 11 H
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The settlement boundary does not accommodate "Site 10" - a site which is being progressed through the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan. See this map from the draft Neighbourhood Plan. This site is in the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies a site that impacts the settlement boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at examination stage and anticipated referendum in the autumn. The Town Council's representative on the Neighbourhood Plan has made input to this response.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		NO	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3113026	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	86	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Jeff Penfold <b>Malmesbury Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 647682	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 86
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>		YES	

<b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		NO but only because they omit some areas	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Malmesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	9 F
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	In accordance with the "exclude gardens" criterion, the boundary bifurcates High Street gardens in cell 10 G. Why does the the boundary not do the same in cell 9 F for The Maltings?		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies a site that impacts the settlement boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at examination stage and anticipated referendum in the autumn. The Town Council's representative on the Neighbourhood Plan has made input to this response.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	NO		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	87	<b>Consultee:</b> Councillor  Andrew  Pearce <b>Councillor</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 87</b>

		<b>Holt Council</b> <b>Person ID: 456561</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No. The exclusion of large residential gardens has not been applied consistently.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Holt	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Yes, probably. A first daft of the plan has been circulated for comment to the village, and suggested modifications are being considered + incorporated. it is hoped to send it to the Council for formal consultation later this year.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	88	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G Turner <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Calne Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390473	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 88
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		N/A	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	There appears to be an error in the map showing the Calne Draft Settlement Boundary. The blue line of the existing boundary currently includes the properties of The Knowle, Stockley Lane SN11 0SE. This is incorrect. These properties are outside the settlement boundary and are in Calne Without Parish?		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>		No	

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>Calne Without Parish Council do not find the plans acceptable as to how the changes have been made and require an updated accurate map for Calne that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- areas such as Marden Farm which have changed boundary/settlements.</li> <li>- all pending and applied for consents identifying appeals outstanding</li> <li>- land already included in Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for development potential</li> </ul> <p>Council also required notice on how future housing on the borders are going to be allocated between Calne and Calne Without</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	89	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Arnall  <b>Person ID:</b> 391369</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 89</p>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Good afternoon Daniel Thank you for the confirmation e-mail. I have now had the opportunity to look at Corsham Town council's response to the "Settlement Boundary Review" We would agree with the request that former military sites should be excluded as they do have different criteria in the core strategy With the exception up to the point that where planning permission has been granted and approved for said former military sites By both planners and town council alike it should then fall / become part of the settlement boundary after all surely that is what all the planning procedures are there for. With the above in mind we feel that our request for "Halfway Firs" to be included with in the settlement boundaries is not an attempt erode or be any less defined If the boundary was moved as per our request then the existing properties would fall within the boundary and as such could not expand further than the boundary. The development of the "Copenacre site" would in effect become well related to the settlement of Corsham and therefore bring "Halfway Firs" into the settlement area by proximity and association The "Copenacre site" will in effect be a similar development to the development at E, F6 which is also north of the A4 and is within the existing settlement boundary. Having read through the council's response I am sure I might be looking at a different map version to theirs? Thank you again for the opportunity to contact you in response to the consultation.</p>	

	<p>If I can be of any further assistance, Please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you and regards,  Peter Arnall</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	90	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Sarah Burden <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Idmiston Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 558768</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 90</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>				
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>				
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		The intention is to submit our neighbourhood plan to Wiltshire Council by the end of this financial year.		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	91	<b>Consultee:</b> mr myles young  <b>Person ID:</b> 856261	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 91
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The plan excludes my Garden which was previously inside the settlement area. I can not see what possible benefit this has to the Parish or Town council. This give all the disadvantages of converting residential property to agricultural property in terms of planning consent, usage and so on The new boundry actualy is right against our back door and excludes all of our garden, which is not large The criteria is not consistent-some gardens are retained others are not,only properties right on the edge of the plan are affected What allowance has been made for the devaluation of properties affected.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No they are inconsistant and unfair	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The boundry to my garden should remain as it is. It is just a family garden		

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>I dont know what this means</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>As per Mr Michael Cox's response: The proposal changes ALL of my rear garden from residential land to agricultural land. This will have a significant effect on the overall value of my property - I too would expect financial compensation for this. The proposal will also significantly effect what the land can be used for - currently it is a garden and this use must continue to be available, not only to me but if I decide to sell the property in the future. "Agricultural use only" will significantly effect the planning consents I need should I wish to build a summerhouse etc.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>92</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Julie Norman <b>Person ID:</b> 730331</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 92</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		

<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Cricklade</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The proposed boundary change carves off a corner of our garden unnecessarily. We use this triangle of land as our garden and wish to continue to do so with all the benefits that arise. Indeed our barn has been placed to isolate this triangle as garden land. Referring specifically to your leaflet, excluding this piece of garden from the settlement of Cricklade does not conform to your exclusions: "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens" - this garden land is not large and does not have the capacity to be built on. "recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)" - this is a small piece of garden land, used as garden and not relating to the countryside in either form or nature. "isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)." - it is not isolated but directly next to our dwelling.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Due to the scale of the blue and green lines - they appear to be about 10m wide! - it is unclear which side ditches, verges and hedges fall.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b></p>			

answers			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	93	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Mary A Towle <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Durrington Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390612	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 93
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Durrington	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated</b>			

<b>timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>Historically Durrington Town Council have been happy with the Salisbury District Local Plan for our area and this is the main reason that we are not developing a Neighbourhood plan to complement the Village Design Statement and Parish Plan already accepted by Wiltshire Council.</p> <p>The new Durrington specific outline boundary changes are in the main acceptable but the area that has now been included which encompasses Avon Valley College and their playing field and the Swimming Pool, which borders the rear of properties in Bulford Road and the Ham (see diag) is of great concern. We wish to safeguard this area especially the open playing field which has in the past been unsuccessful in a SLAA application for housing because it was used as a playing field and sited outside the building line. The proposed change could open this up for development in years to come.</p> <p>Your views on what safeguards can be put in place to conform with our VDS and secure the longevity of this open space would be appreciated</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3114801 (PDF Letter)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	94	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Linda Roberts <b>Town Clerk</b> <b>Calne Town Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 812393	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 94
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b>		Yes	

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H2/ H3
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	It was suggested and agreed by Members to recommend that the area of land in H2/ H3 is brought back in line with the bypass to ensure that the land on the northern side of the bypass adjacent to the A3102 remains outside and not within the town boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes, estimated end 2015		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>Members noted the wording on page 2 of the paper, which states that “other than in circumstances, as permitted by other policies within the Core Strategy, development will not be permitted outside the defined settlement boundaries. The settlement boundaries may only be altered through the identification of sites for development through site allocations and neighbourhood plans”.</p> <p>Members were generally sceptical of this statement in light of the amount of housing development Calne has had to accommodate in recent years. We are clearly vulnerable until our NP is made and until then we are at the mercy of the developers.</p>		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	95	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Deborah James <b>Coombe Bissett &amp; Homington Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 391796</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 95</b>

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	<p>These are the views of the Council and not of the Parish clerk (who is our contact point). You have included large gardens (marked in pink on the map enclosed). The parish Council do NOT support ANY changes to the CURRENT settlement boundary as they were only agreed 3 years ago in 2011. A parish plan was produced in 2012 after extensive consultation. Residents expressed preference for NO new development. The Parish Council confirms that they do NOT support and [any] of the proposed draft settlement boundary.</p>	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	Coombe Bissett
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>	No.		

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Yes.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3116517 (map)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	96	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Stan  Johnston <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Roundway Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 849961	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 96
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>			

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?		This matter was discussed at a meeting of Roundway Parish council on 15 September 2014. The council noted the document but reiterated that it was not compatible with the Neighbourhood Plan. Rather the council endorses it in the Neighbourhood Plan which should take precedence.	
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	97	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Roger Coleman <b>Clerk</b> <b>Southwick Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 712546</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 97</b>
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?		No comment.	
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft		No comment.	

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Southwick Parish Council does not seek any modifications.	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Southwick Parish Council is open to consideration of modest 'allocation sites' but would wish to learn of possible development plans from developers before offering a view.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	98	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Marion Barton <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Shrewton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 558192</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 98</b>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible.</li> <li>Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</li> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</li> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>We agree generally but with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be included.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs. The two housing allocation areas are:</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H2, H3</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow. See Question 5.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Add the area of the Community Hall and Recreation Ground, which are major community facilities</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.</p> <p>Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships.</p>		

	<p>Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton’s case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses.</p> <p>It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council.</p> <p>(continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council.</p> <p>For some reason that we can’t understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format.</p> <p>We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>2 x Maps</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>99</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Marion Barton <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Shrewton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 558192</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 99</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b></p>	<p>We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and</li> </ul>		

<p><b>proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible. Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</li> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>We agree generally but with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be included.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs. The two housing allocation areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts</li> </ul>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>13</p>

	<p>Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow. See Question 5.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Add SHLAA 113 area earmarked for 10+ small homes for the elderly with live in care workers, as part of a Wilts Council initiative</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.</p> <p>Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships.</p> <p>Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton's case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses.</p> <p>It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council.</p>		

	<p>(continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council. For some reason that we can't understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format.</p> <p>We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>100</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Marion Barton <b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Shrewton Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 558192</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 100</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible. Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</li> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included</li> </ul>		

	<p>in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>We agree generally but with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be included.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs.</p> <p>The two housing allocation areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow.</li> </ul> <p>See Question 5.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>J3, K3, L3, M3, M2</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your</b></p>	<p>Add housing allocation area for 64+ new houses in part of the SHLAA 153 &amp; 154, and extend boundary to include existing village housing.</p>		

<p>proposed change?</p>	
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.</p> <p>Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships.</p> <p>Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton's case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses.</p> <p>It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council.</p> <p>(continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council. For some reason that we can't understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar</p>

		<p>in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format. We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	101	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Marion  Barton <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Shrewton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 558192</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 101</p>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible. Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</li> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</li> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>		<p>We agree generally but with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be</li> </ul>	

<p><b>criterion?</b></p>	<p>included.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul> </p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs.                      The two housing allocation areas are:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow.                      See Question 5.</li> </ul> </p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>J6, J5, K6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>New site for proposed sports facility, particularly cricket</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.                      Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the</p>		

	<p>boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships. Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton's case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses.</p> <p>It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council.</p> <p>(continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council. For some reason that we can't understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format.</p> <p>We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b></p>	

answers			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	102	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Marion  Barton <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Shrewton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 558192	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 102
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible. Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</li> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</li> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		We agree generally but with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be included.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul>	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>

<p><b>the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs.</p> <p>The two housing allocation areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow.</li> </ul> <p>See Question 5.</p>	<p><b>your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.</p> <p>Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been</p>		

<p><b>to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships. Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton’s case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses. It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council. (continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council. For some reason that we can’t understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format. We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3116910</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>103</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Marion Barton <b>Clerk</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 103</p>

		<p><b>Shrewton Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID: 558192</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>We generally agree the criterion and supporting criteria, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a contradiction in the criteria – community facilities include sports &amp; recreational facilities with structures e.g. pitch lighting and also employment. We assess that all community facilities including community halls with attached recreational grounds, should be included in entirety within the settlement boundary. In our case, the community hall is at a distance into the recreation ground, away from the settlement boundary. If this is not done, then the only alternatives are to exclude the community hall or to have a strip of land across the recreational ground, connecting the community hall to the settlement boundary – neither are acceptable or sensible.</li> <li>• Similarly, this contradiction could also exclude school playgrounds and fenced open play areas – these should also be included. We note that Wilts Council has included in the settlement area the open spaces belonging to the village school; by doing this, Wilts Council is creating the precedent and concurring with our assessment above. We recommend that Wilts Council clarify its criteria accordingly.</li> <li>• Farm buildings in a farmyard should be considered together. We have cases where some farm buildings in a farmyard have been included in the settlement and others have not. Wherever possible, avoid putting a settlement boundary through a group of buildings that have a common purpose and/or common ownership.</li> <li>• Where there are open areas within the settlement boundary that need to remain open areas these are recorded in the open areas consultation.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>We agree generally but with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land. The policy should be consistent, as described in our comment on Question 1.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded properties on the edge of the village that are contiguous to other village buildings. They should be included.</li> <li>• The settlement boundary has excluded community assets,</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Yes. Modifications are required to include community assets and orphaned buildings that are part of the village and settlement. Modifications are also required to include housing allocation areas to meet the Wilts Council housing targets and for development under the Shrewton Neighbourhood Plan, based on existing SHLAAs. The two housing allocation areas are:</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</li> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow. See Question 5.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The development of the Neighbourhood Plan is far advanced and due to complete the process at referendum in early 2015. The first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan will be circulated for community consultation on 30 Sep 2014. It contains a new draft settlement boundary, developed in consultation with Wilts Council, that takes into account the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, community facilities and modifications proposed by Wilts Council. The anticipated timetable for the review of the Settlement Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan to be completed is Dec 2014.</p> <p>Wilts Council is requested to use the Shrewton Settlement Boundary that is in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, bearing mind that the boundary for the main housing allocation area only may change shape (the size of the area won't change) as a result of the community consultation, particularly to accommodate concerns over views. Jane Macey, Wilts Council confirmed on 29 August that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shrewton should include variations on the housing allocation area and caveats in this submission. (See map). We have removed the variations, but caveat the right to change the housing allocation boundary in the J3, K3 area if required by the community consultation.</li> <li>• There would be a follow up consultation by Wilts Council later this year, which would provide time for refinement following the community consultation prior to the referendum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It is confusing to have a settlement boundary review taking place just before the housing target for large villages is due to be announced, and is exacerbated by Wilts Council proposing a settlement boundary that is incapable of absorbing any housing target. It would have been more effective and efficient to have conducted this consultation after the announcement of provisional housing targets. To use the results of the settlement boundary consultation to inform the housing allocation targets is a less efficient and effective approach (particularly with 2 consultations on the settlement boundary). It would have been better for all if provisional housing targets had been given to each village as part of the settlement consultation, enabling local communities to discuss internally with each other and come to terms with change, and opening up the possibility of some inter-community horse trading to accommodate the overall targets, without much effort by Wilts Council. As it is, the fear in several villages is that centralised planners in Wilts Council will decide the housing allocation and the settlement boundary, then to force it onto each village, which is detrimental to Wilts Council – community relationships.</p>		

	<p>Assuming the housing target is published (in Shrewton’s case, between 21 - 40 houses are expected), this will be subsumed into the current community requirement for 64+ houses.  It is inexplicable why this is being done in isolation of other reviews and consultations. This settlement boundary review is taking place at the same time as two other boundary reviews by Wilts Council – the Community Governance Review (CGR) and one other review of higher level boundaries, as well as two consultations. The CGR is likely to affect Shrewton. However, there would appear to be no coordination across these reviews, with the Neighbourhood Planning or with the unfolding consequences of the Army Basing Plan. All of this evidences a shortcoming in communication and coordination within and by Wilts Council. We strongly request more effective communication and coordination, as well as more inclusive, transparent behaviour by Wilts Council.  (continued on the next page)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Question 3 asks for Grid References of the changes to the proposed draft settlement boundaries by Wilts Council.  For some reason that we can’t understand, there is a distortion in the jpg map provided, such that the overlays do not align with the Ordnance Survey GIS mapping on PSMA, including the Landranger series. It is as if the centre of Shrewton has been stretched, but not the top and bottom. So we have had to correct the differences manually. Wilts Council has not provided any reference to access the GIS mapping overlay on the GIS mapping available through the PSMA. This would have been an effective and efficient way to conduct this consultation. To ensure accuracy and efficiency, we strongly recommend that the GIS overlays for both the green and blue lines (or similar in the next consultation) are provided either via the PSMA Parish Online mapping or as an export file in a common GIS standard format.  We strongly request that Wilts Council makes much more use of the PSMA mapping when working with towns and parishes. It is an excellent, but underused, government facility.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3116909</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>104</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b>  MR  TIMOTHY  VINCE  <b>Person ID:</b> 858377</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 104</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Semington, Pound Lane, northern section of field bordering the road, between houses numbers 12 and 14	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The settlement line should exclude the entire field.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The line drawn across the back gardens of 16, 18 and 20 Pound Lane seems to be arbitrary and inequitable.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	105	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Gavin Lester <b>Person ID:</b> 858396	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 105

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Unclear as the plan for Chippenham isn't included here</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>I consider the current boundaries sufficient for a town of this size and low unemployment. There is plenty of room for expansion within the town with heading into the countryside along the A350</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>West of the A350 should remain the western edge of the town. There is no need or benefit to development there and considerable risk of reduced enjoyment of the town and countryside for those who live here.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>It is to extend West of the A350 for industrial/distribution development</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Just an interested and worried local</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Changes do not seem to be as well advertised nor explained around this area - we need more clarity and more time for review/discussion on all sides.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>  	 106	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Roger Budgen <b>Chair</b>  <b>St Paul Malmesbury Without Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858440	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 106
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	YES		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	NO but only because they omit some areas		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	St Paul Malmesbury Without	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	11 H Malmesbury
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The settlement boundary does not accommodate "Site 10" - a site that is being progressed through the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan. See this map from the draft Neighbourhood Plan. This site is in the parish of St Paul Malmesbury Without.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan identifies a site that impacts the settlement boundary. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at examination stage and anticipated referendum in the autumn.		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		NO	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3117753 (map)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	107	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Charlotte  Rogers-Jones <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Cricklade Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 837407	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 107
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Criterion (1) No comment Criterion (2). In order to improve clarity, we suggest that the words "Both Built" preface the text and the deletion of "existing". Criterion (3). Non comment. This is not relevant for Cricklade or Chelworth. Criterion (4). We suggest this might be amended to (additional text in bold) as "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement unless this would move the existing settlement boundary to decrease the land area within the settlement. This includes large residential gardens. Criterion (5). The draft definition does not appear to properly capture the exclusion from the Cricklade settlement of the current open spaces that are Cricklade's Town Walls. We request the addition of " or are Scheduled Ancient Monuments ". Criterion (6) No comment	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Cricklade, North Wiltshire	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H4/14
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Grid Ref H4/14 Cricklade. This appears to be the result of a general principle that the line is drawn on the built side of a road or lane that forms the boundary, rather than including the road or lane within the settlement. If so, it is suggested that this should be stated as a general principle that is being applied.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We are not looking at reviewing the Cricklade settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan, but please see our response to Question 5.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Within the Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan, Cricklade Town Council is proposing to develop criteria that would be applied to new housing development by January 2015 and these may affect the location of the settlement boundary.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	108	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Charlotte  Rogers-Jones <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Cricklade Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 837407	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 108
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Criterion (1) No comment Criterion (2). In order to improve clarity, we suggest that the words "Both Built" preface the text and the deletion of "existing". Criterion (3). Non comment. This is not relevant for Cricklade or Chelworth. Criterion (4). We suggest this might be amended to (additional text in bold) as "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement unless this would move the existing settlement boundary to decrease the land area within the settlement. This includes large residential gardens. Criterion (5). The draft definition does not appear to properly capture the exclusion from the Cricklade settlement of the current open		

	spaces that are Cricklade's Town Walls. We request the addition of " or are Scheduled Ancient Monuments ". Criterion (6) No comment		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Cricklade, North Wiltshire	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Grid ref: J4 Cricklade. This boundary is not acceptable and appears to breach criterion 4.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We are not looking at reviewing the Cricklade settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan, but please see our response to Question 5.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Within the Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan, Cricklade Town Council is proposing to develop criteria that would be applied to new housing development by January 2015 and these may affect the location of the settlement boundary.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	109	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Charlotte Rogers-Jones <b>Town Clerk</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 109

		<b>Cricklade Town Council</b> <b>Person ID: 837407</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Criterion (1) No comment                  Criterion (2). In order to improve clarity, we suggest that the words "Both Built" preface the text and the deletion of "existing".                  Criterion (3). Non comment. This is not relevant for Cricklade or Chelworth.                  Criterion (4). We suggest this might be amended to (additional text in bold) as "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement unless this would move the existing settlement boundary to decrease the land area within the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.                  Criterion (5). The draft definition does not appear to properly capture the exclusion from the Cricklade settlement of the current open spaces that are Cricklade's Town Walls. We request the addition of " or are Scheduled Ancient Monuments ".                  Criterion (6) No comment</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Cricklade, North Wiltshire	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Grid ref K6 Cricklade. This boundary is not acceptable as it appears to breach criterion 4. The gardens are relatively large compared with adjacent development.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We are not looking at reviewing the Cricklade settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan, but please see our response to Question 5.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>	Within the Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan, Cricklade Town Council is proposing to develop criteria that would be applied to new housing development by January 2015 and these may affect the location of the settlement boundary.		

to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	110	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Charlotte Rogers-Jones <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Cricklade Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 837407	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 110
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Criterion (1) No comment Criterion (2). In order to improve clarity, we suggest that the words "Both Built" preface the text and the deletion of "existing". Criterion (3). Non comment. This is not relevant for Cricklade or Chelworth. Criterion (4). We suggest this might be amended to (additional text in bold) as "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement unless this would move the existing settlement boundary to decrease the land area within the settlement. This includes large residential gardens. Criterion (5). The draft definition does not appear to properly capture the exclusion from the Cricklade settlement of the current open spaces that are Cricklade's Town Walls. We request the addition of " or are Scheduled Ancient Monuments ". Criterion (6) No comment	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Cricklade, North Wiltshire	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	A12 and B12 and beyond

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		A12, B12 and beyond. Cricklade Town Council is of the view that the Chelworth Industrial Areas have become sufficiently sizeable to now be included in the Cricklade Settlement Boundary Review. The Chelworth Industrial Areas are now physically distinct from Cricklade but are directly associated with it, material in scale and functionally related to the Cricklade settlement (criterion 1) for employment purposes. Work to produce a map is in progress by Cricklade Town Council, this is in progress and will be forwarded for consideration.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		We are not looking at reviewing the Cricklade settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan, but please see our response to Question 5.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Within the Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan, Cricklade Town Council is proposing to develop criteria that would be applied to new housing development by January 2015 and these may affect the location of the settlement boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	111	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Charlotte Rogers-Jones <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Cricklade Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 837407	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 111
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Criterion (1) No comment Criterion (2). In order to improve clarity, we suggest that the words "Both Built" preface the text and the deletion of "existing". Criterion (3). Non comment. This is not relevant for Cricklade or Chelworth. Criterion (4). We suggest this might be amended to (additional text in bold) as "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement unless this would move the existing settlement boundary to decrease the land area within the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.	

	<p>Criterion (5). The draft definition does not appear to properly capture the exclusion from the Cricklade settlement of the current open spaces that are Cricklade's Town Walls. We request the addition of " or are Scheduled Ancient Monuments ".</p> <p>Criterion (6) No comment</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Cricklade, North Wiltshire	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	G9
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	G9 Cricklade. There appears to be a minor drafting error and the green line enclosing the "box shaped" garage section should be deleted - the garage, which has permission for conversion to a dwelling, is part of the settlement area.		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	We are not looking at reviewing the Cricklade settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan, but please see our response to Question 5.		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	Within the Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan, Cricklade Town Council is proposing to develop criteria that would be applied to new housing development by January 2015 and these may affect the location of the settlement boundary.		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	112	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Steven Hall</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 112</p>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 858504	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Semington, Pound Lane, northern section of field bordering the road, between houses numbers 12 and 14 Draft Proposal Settlement Boundries Map Grid Reference: H6	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The settlement line should exclude the entire field.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting</b>			

<b>documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	113	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Beverley Cornish <b>Clerk</b> <b>Downton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 467669	<b>Agent:</b> Mrs Beverley Cornish Clerk & RFO Downton Parish Council <b>Person ID:</b> 113
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No comment.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No comment.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>		The Downton Neighbourhood Plan is underway and should be completed by December 2015.	

<b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Downton Parish Council has no objection to the proposed revision of the Settlement Boundary as set out in the draft plan for Downton. However, it does not consider that the 190 houses allocated to Downton in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy can be delivered within the current or the revised Settlement Boundary. The parish is in the process of producing a community-led Neighbourhood Plan which should be completed by the end of 2015 and this will inform the Parish Council on the sites outside the Settlement Boundary which are indentified as favourable for development in order to meet the required target up to 2026.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	114	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Richard H.  Wharton  <b>Person ID:</b> 448272	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 114
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Alderbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	

<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Yesterday, through the kind offices of a member of the Alderbury Parish Council, I received a copy of your Spatial Planning Policy email dated Friday July 25 and other documents. I note that this was just three working days before the end of the eight-week boundary review process as stated in your communication.</p> <p>My detached house, Byways, occupies a half-acre plot fronting on to Southampton Road, Alderbury, SP5 3AF.</p> <p>From the relevant Plan, I see that you propose to remove the existing settlement boundary so as to extend the area in which I believe no development will be permitted, beyond my neighbour's virtually abandoned area at the rear of my property to include half of my property</p> <p>This is naturally of extreme concern to me and I find it incredible that this action, which potentially could be disadvantageous to, me has been taken not just without consultation but without even the courtesy of any prior advice of it.</p> <p>As a widower and sole occupier aged eighty-six, I have increasingly been considering down-sizing and moving to Salisbury.</p> <p>I understand that the reason for what I have been told is called "a modification of the building line" is because "the County Council does not want any infilling".</p> <p>However, you will be aware that the two properties opposite – The Heather and Out of the Way – have each been demolished and replaced by three houses and four bungalows respectively. In the light of these developments you will also appreciate that it would almost certainly be in my financial interest to consider similar development on my property at some stage, and indeed I have already been approached by a developer.</p> <p>Your proposal made (I reiterate) without my knowledge, would effectively remove from me any choice in the matter and potentially devalue quite significantly the value of my property.</p> <p>The Call for Sites section of your Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan document states " The plan making process for this DPD will involve the consideration of site proposals". If my interpretation of this is correct, by copy of this letter I am requesting the Alderbury Parish Council to act on my behalf in investigating and making representations for the removal of the "Proposed revision to settlement boundary" as shown on the Plan.</p>		

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	115	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Vincent Mobey <b>Person ID:</b> 858528	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 115
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Cricklade	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>			

<p><b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries – Informal Consultation with Parish and Town Councils. Part C – Comments on any specific areas of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries.</p> <p>We have read the abovementioned document and the supplementary map ref: 100049050, 2014.</p> <p>We would hope that you might please further consider our own views at this draft stage of the boundaries review.</p> <p>Within that document, you have identified the following excluded areas, – curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>What is not clear, is why you have chosen to exclude these specific areas at this time?</p> <p>Our house and gardens sits part within and part without of the current Cricklade boundary line. Within the parts that sit outside of that boundary line there are already, numerous permitted developments to include residential garden, a three car garage with substantial block paved hard standing, long vehicular driveway with residential gates and tarmac dropped kerb through to that garden area for access, garden storage shed, touring caravan, vegetable and flower gardens, fruit trees and other numerous garden paraphernalia. These permitted developments have been added by us, to our land and gardens gradually and all over the last twenty plus years since this house was built new for us to move our family into. This request is not for speculative or sporadic development, only as further retirement options for my aging family to be allowed to downsize to.</p> <p>Our large residential garden is distinctly not open rolling countryside nor would it be considered to be encroaching onto the countryside as it is already a well-established residential garden. As a garden, I expect to be allowed to add further buildings or structures (within permitted development rights) and this expresses an acceptance of the existing planning law for a tolerance to allow buildings, development and uses of this type and on this very parcel of garden land. The existing and current historic boundary line for Cricklade does not reflect the true identity of the town or take into account the numerous expansions and developments that have taken place over the years since that plan was last drawn up.</p> <p>Cricklade has to take up its own share of the new housing requirement for Wiltshire Council and this parcel of land is ideal for inclusion into the plan to accommodate further appropriate residential housing development. We have already asked Cricklade Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Committee for their support with this submission and to allow for this windfall development which will contribute towards the controlled growth, vitality and long term viability of Cricklade.</p> <p>My wife and I were invited by Cricklade Council, along with other Cricklade landowners, to submit to their Neighbourhood Planning Committee and Public Consultation Display Days, plans and proposals to be considered by them and the electorate for when their plan is</p>

	<p>prepared and finally submitted for adoption.</p> <p>We understand that there have been no objections raised to our submission to date and that the Cricklade Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Committee must therefore be deemed to broadly support this request for this parcel of land to be included within the proposed revised boundary and within the permitted building line for Cricklade.</p> <p>The area of land proposed is found on your map 100049050, 2014 – Grid Reference: G9. Please find attached, our own site plan on the Land Registry document: WT313206 for your consideration. The area that we are asking to be considered for inclusion within a revised boundary and building line is coloured – Blue on that plan. That area identified as blue, already has a substantial and WC Approved dropped kerb vehicle entrance laid to it and with egress and exit onto Chelworth Road. As is also evident on that plan and clearly seen from various viewpoints, both of my neighbours (60 and 61 The Fiddle) have also long since (10 years +) extended their own gardens well beyond and outside of the existing boundary line and they have also created manicured lawns, constructed sheds, greenhouses, flower beds, specimen trees, fish ponds and other residential garden items. This surely further endorses and supports our reasonable request for consideration as this whole area is clearly and already seen to be well established as residential gardens and cannot be seen to be a new incursion into open countryside. However, all that we are asking to be considered here and now is our own parcel of land that is coloured blue on the Land Registry document as provided here.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3120291</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>116</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Roger Coleman <b>Semington Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 396082</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 116</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>No.</p>		

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Semington	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Semington Parish Council cannot understand the reasons for the proposed new boundaries not following the normal curtilages of houses and field boundaries. For example, at Grid Reference G6 there is a horizontal (East/West) division of the field. The criterion that excludes 'curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' is not agreed.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	117	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Reg Williams <b>Person ID:</b> 820831	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 117

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>J4, K4, L4, J5, K5, L5, K6, L6 Hampton Park</p>

<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3.1 Grid ref J4, K4, L4, J5, K5, L5, K6, L6 Hampton Park. The new Country Park adjacent to Hampton Park Salisbury should be outside the new settlement boundary rather than included within it. Under the draft methodology this should be considered as 'recreational or amenity space at the edge of communities which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)'.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as 'small villages' which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary. 5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>118</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Reg Williams <b>Person ID:</b> 820831</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 118</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted: 1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core</p>		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>F6 Bemerton Heath</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3.2 Grid ref F6 Bemerton Heath. The land within the Folly green space has been included within the proposed settlement boundary when previously it was excluded. It would be better to maintain the green corridor leading to this area – the former housing boundary should be retained at this point [see point 1.3 above].</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any</b></p>	<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the</p>		

<p><b>additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as ‘small villages’ which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary.                      5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that ‘some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities’ [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in ‘small villages’, specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that ‘development will be limited to infill within the existing built area’. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these ‘small villages’ mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the ‘small villages’ around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as ‘small villages’ similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>119</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b>                      Mr                       Reg                       Williams   <b>Person ID:</b> 820831</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>   <b>Person ID:</b> 119</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:                      1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical ‘such as walls, fences, hedgerows’ and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a ‘large’ garden.                       1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p>		

	<p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other ‘green corridors’ which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a ‘green corridor’ linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>I8 – Imerys Quarry/Fugglestone Red</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3.3 Grid ref I8 – Imerys Quarry/Fugglestone Red. There should be a gap between the Fugglestone Red strategic development site and the former Imerys Quarry site, see comment re ‘green corridors’ at 1.3 above. The Imerys Quarry development template in the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy is adjacent to an ‘area of undevelopable land’ – this is currently included within the settlement boundary and should be excluded from it as part of the gap between Imerys site and Fugglestone Red. The sports grounds to the south of Sarum Academy should also form part of this ‘green corridor’ and be excluded from the settlement boundary’.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as ‘small villages’ which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary. 5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that ‘some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities’ [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in ‘small villages’, specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that ‘development will be limited to infill within the existing built area’. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these ‘small villages’ mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which</p>		

		will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	120	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Reg  Williams  <b>Person ID:</b> 820831	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 120
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b>			

<p><b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H8, H9, I9 – Churchfields</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3.4 Grid ref H8, H9, I9 – Churchfields. Around Churchfields, the settlement boundary should not follow the water course but should be set back from the river bank to include a green margin around the site, this would comply with the development template for this site which includes 'green corridors adjacent to the River Nadde</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as 'small villages' which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary. 5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	121	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Reg Williams <b>Person ID:</b> 820831	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 121
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park.          Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>	Salisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>	J10 – Cathedral Close

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		3.5 Grid ref J10 – Cathedral Close. I do not believe it is appropriate to include the car park at the southern end of the Close within the Settlement boundary, this removes a green corridor stretching in from the River Avon to the Cathedral Close [see point 1.3 above]. Instead the boundary at the SE of the Close should follow the previous line around the housing on De Vaux Place.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		n/a	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as ‘small villages’ which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that ‘some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities’ [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in ‘small villages’, specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that ‘development will be limited to infill within the existing built area’. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these ‘small villages’ mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the ‘small villages’ around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as ‘small villages’ similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	122	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Reg Williams <b>Person ID:</b> 820831	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 122
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>		In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:	

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical ‘such as walls, fences, hedgerows’ and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a ‘large’ garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other ‘green corridors’ which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a ‘green corridor’ linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>M10 – Petersfinger</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>3.6 Grid Ref M10 – Petersfinger. The Settlement boundary seems to follow the city boundary at this point when there is housing on Petersfinger Road immediately outside the city boundary which it could be argued is ‘physically/functionally’ related to Salisbury. The city boundary is not one of the criteria for defining the settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>5.1 Without wishing to confuse this with the Parish Boundary review, there appear to potentially be some anomalies generated by the definition of Quidhampton, Netherhampton and Laverstock and Ford as 'small villages' which therefore do not have a defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>5.2 The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	123	<b>Consultee:</b> mrs  Melissa  Atyeo <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Sutton Veny Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858536	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 123
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b>		No	

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Sutton Veny Parish	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> See below
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Objections have been raised by residents of the village where the proposed new boundary bisects their gardens.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Sutton Veny Parish Council ask to be consulted where there are any future changes to the boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	124	<b>Consultee:</b> Veronica  Hourihane <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Oaksey Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858541	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 124
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b>		The PC considered the criteria listed on p3 and are satisfied that they represent a reasonable rationale for inclusion and exclusion	

<b>proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The answer to this will involve considerable consultation with the community. The crude lines drawn on the map will require clearer definition to ensure that all of the space involved is consistent with the criteria. see Q4	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Q3 can only be answered once full consultation has been undertaken on the neighbourhood plan. Q4 Yes. We are currently just starting the process of developing the neighbourhood plan. Because of the lack(absence) of funding to help us this may take longer than ideal. We would anticipate putting a plan to the community before next summer.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The settlement boundary is of central importance to our neighbourhood plan, and whilst we are generally in agreement with the key drivers of the change as they impact on the village, we do require some flexibility to run these changes parallel with ur plan. Can you please confirm with us that you will accommodate these views? Thanks.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	125	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 125

		<b>Person ID:</b> 403912	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe  Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:  ‘Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens’ - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow line of expected planning permission 13/05724/OUT Existing and extant planning permissions		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		

<p>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>126</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 126</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for</p>		

<b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow Skynet Drive This area is developed		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	127	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 127
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group                  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.                  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:                  'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.                   'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.                   'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Rudloe</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>K9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Follow Park Lane                  This area is developed</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	128	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby  <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 128
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b>		Yes	

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I/J9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Continue to follow Park Lane Former telephone exchange exclude.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	129	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 129
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded		

	<p>from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Rudloe</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>F/G 7/8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Include play area Formal play areas included</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	130	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 130
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary. 'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded. 'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Follow road		

<p>proposed change?</p>	<p>More defined boundary</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>131</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 131</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings,</p>		

	renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	15
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	132	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 132

		<b>Person ID:</b> 403912	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe  Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:  ‘Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens’ - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  ‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  ‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>The two houses closest to Academy Drive should be included within the settlement boundary which should then follow the A4  The two houses are more closely related to the settlement</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		

<p>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>133</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby  <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 133</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for</p>		

<b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G/H/I 4/5/6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow A4 More defined boundary, properties North of A4 are more closely related to the countryside		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	134	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 134
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group                  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.                  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:                  'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.                   'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.                   'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Corsham</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>I 4/5/6/7/8/9</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary                  More defined boundary, properties East of Pound Pill are more closely related to the countryside</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	135	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby  <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 135
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b>		Yes	

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow edge of back garden line. The gardens here are no larger than others which have not been excluded		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	136	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 136
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded		

	<p>from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	<p>Yes</p>		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	<p>Corsham</p>	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	<p>L 10</p>
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary, properties the other side of the road are more closely related to the countryside</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	137	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 137
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary. 'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded. 'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J 11/12, K11
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Follow back garden line.		

<p><b>proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The gardens here are no larger than others which have not been excluded</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>138</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 138</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings,</p>		

	renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J11
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow road until you meet the back gardens of Dicketts Road and then follow this line No sense in excluding highway verge.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	139	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 139

		<b>Person ID:</b> 403912	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe  Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:  ‘Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens’ - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  ‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  ‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I11
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary  Formal play areas should be included.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		

<p>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>140</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 140</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for</p>		

<b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I H 11
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow existing settlement boundary No sense in excluding highway verge.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	141	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 141
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group                  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.                  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:                  'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.                   'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.                   'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Corsham</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G 10/11</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary                  More defined boundary</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	142	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby  <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 142
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b>		Yes	

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F/G 11
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow existing settlement boundary Potley application no 14/05686/OUT		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	143	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 143
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded		

	<p>from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Corsham</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>F 11</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	144	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 144
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe          Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group          We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.          With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:          'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	<p>Yes</p>		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	E/F/G 10
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Follow road to exclude Potley Fishing Lakes		

<p><b>proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Informal open space more closely related to the countryside</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>145</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 145</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings,</p>		

	renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	D9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	146	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 146

		<b>Person ID:</b> 403912	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe  Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group  We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy.  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:  ‘Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens’ - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  ‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  ‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are ‘existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement’ but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	B/C 8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>Follow existing settlement boundary  Quarry more related to the countryside</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		

<p>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>147</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby  <b>Person ID:</b> 403912</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 147</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Corsham/Rudloe Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group We are happy with the criterion for defining the areas to be included but feel that former military sites should be excluded as they are subject to different criteria in the Core Strategy. With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments: 'Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens' - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.  'Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature' - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.  'Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)' - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary (see paragraph 2, above).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>	<p>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for</p>		

<b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria. We would recommend that where community facilities are outlying and relate more to the rural edge, they should be excluded if it enables a clearer more defined boundary.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Corsham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	B/C/D 7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Follow A4 Copenacre site should be excluded as ex military sites are treated differently by the Core Strategy; highway verges should be included; properties north of the A4 should be excluded as more closely related to the countryside.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Up to two years; our Steering Group has begun work on the Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	148	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Kirsty Gilby <b>Person ID:</b> 403912	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 148

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Consultation Chippenham  Comments to Planning from Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group  With regard to areas to be excluded we would like to make the following comments:  ‘Curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens’ - we would rather the boundary line follow the edge of large gardens in built up areas but on the edge of settlements where a few houses are not well related to the settlement, and where we do not want to see the settlement extended, we feel that entire properties should be excluded from the settlement boundary in order to have a more defined, defensible settlement boundary.</p> <p>‘Recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside in form or nature’ - we feel that formal, maintained play areas should be included but informal open space should be excluded.</p> <p>‘Isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)’ - we feel that this could be applied more strictly to create a more defined settlement boundary .</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>We feel this should be closely looked at by Chippenham.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Chippenham: Yes, we feel this should be closely looked at by Chippenham.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Highway verges should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as they are Wiltshire Council owned and maintained.  The settlement boundary at Chippenham should remain east of the A350.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you</b></p>			

<b>have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	149	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Brian Toogood <b>Agent</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 858571	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 149
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Following my telephone call this morning I confirm that you advised me that individuals can request changes to the settlement boundaries and that it is not the exclusive right of the Parish Councils.</p> <p>I am acting as agent for the owner of land at 'The Bottom' Urchfont.</p> <p>The Owner:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Mrs Patricia Banwell The Willows Marsh Road Rode Frome BA11 6PE</p> <p>At the present time the boundaries fall into two main areas with a small parcel of land between. My client owns that small parcel of land and requests that the settlement boundaries be amended to include that parcel of land and thereby join the two main sections of the village together.</p> <p>I attach three plans which I trust will be adequate for you to locate the parcel of land and the requested alterations to the boundaries. If however you require additional information please contact me.</p> <p>I believe that the Parish Council is considering including this parcel of land within the boundaries in their submission which you will already have received or will receive by 22 nd September. I also understand that they are considering the inclusion of the land in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.</p>	

	This parcel of land was discussed at a meeting of the Eastern Area Planning Committee on Thursday 7 th August 2014. At that meeting both Councillor Whitehead and Councillor Gamble, as well as a representative of the Parish Council, expressed their opinion that this land should be included within the village boundaries.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3120286 (x3 maps)		

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>150</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Brian Toogood <b>Agent</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 858571</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 150</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>		<p>Following my telephone call this morning I confirm that you advised me that individuals can request changes to the settlement boundaries and that it is not the exclusive right of the Parish Councils.</p> <p>I am acting as agent for the owner of land at 'The Bottom' Urchfont.</p> <p>The Owner:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Mrs Patricia Banwell The Willows Marsh Road Rode Frome BA11 6PE</p> <p>At the present time the boundaries fall into two main areas with a small parcel of land between. My client owns that small parcel of land and requests that the settlement boundaries be amended to include that parcel of land and thereby join the two main sections of the village together.</p> <p>I attach three plans which I trust will be adequate for you to locate the parcel of land and the requested alterations to the boundaries. If however you require additional information please contact me.</p> <p>I believe that the Parish Council is considering including this parcel of land within the boundaries in their submission which you will already have received or will receive by 22 nd September. I also understand that they are considering the inclusion of the land in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This parcel of land was discussed at a meeting of the Eastern Area Planning Committee on Thursday 7 th August 2014. At that meeting both Councillor Whitehead and Councillor Gamble, as well as a representative of the Parish Council, expressed their opinion that this land should be included within the village boundaries.</p>	

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3120285 (x3 maps)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	151	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Brian Toogood <b>Agent</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 858571	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 151

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Following my telephone call this morning I confirm that you advised me that individuals can request changes to the settlement boundaries and that it is not the exclusive right of the Parish Councils.</p> <p>I am acting as agent for the owner of land at 'The Bottom' Urchfont.</p> <p>The Owner:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Mrs Patricia Banwell The Willows Marsh Road Rode Frome BA11 6PE</p> <p>At the present time the boundaries fall into two main areas with a small parcel of land between. My client owns that small parcel of land and requests that the settlement boundaries be amended to include that parcel of land and thereby join the two main sections of the village together.</p> <p>I attach three plans which I trust will be adequate for you to locate the parcel of land and the requested alterations to the boundaries. If however you require additional information please contact me.</p> <p>I believe that the Parish Council is considering including this parcel of land within the boundaries in their submission which you will already have received or will receive by 22 nd September. I also understand that they are considering the inclusion of the land in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This parcel of land was discussed at a meeting of the Eastern Area Planning Committee on Thursday 7 th August 2014. At that meeting both Councillor Whitehead and Councillor Gamble, as well as a representative of the Parish Council, expressed their opinion that this land should be included within the village boundaries.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>			

criterion?			
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?			
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers		3120287 (x3 maps)	
Comment ID:	152	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Tony Gregson <b>Member</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858606	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 152
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement			

<b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Great Somerford	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5; J5; J6; K7; H7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>We note that the Council's proposed new boundary line tidies up those areas where development has already taken place. However, the draft Neighbour Hood Plan extends these areas a little further. A copy of the schematic from the plan is enclosed and you will see that our proposals for the new settlement boundary are shown by the blue hatched areas. For you convenience I will identify the new areas according to the grid references on the Council's schematic:</p> <p>HS Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP6.          JS Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP3.          J6 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NPS.          K7 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP2.          H7 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP1.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	First of all please note that I am writing on behalf of the Great Somerford Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3120475 (map + comments)		

<b>Comment ID:</b>	153	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Tony Gregson <b>Member</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858606	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 153
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Great Somerford	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>			

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3120476 (map + comments)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	154	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Margaret Carey <b>Clerk</b> <b>Box Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 432813</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 154</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		√	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Rudloe	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G7, H7, G6, H6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Box Parish Council recommends that Park Avenue, Rudloe is removed from the proposals. These Houses were built in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances as MOD housing. To allow this in the settlement boundary could encourage encroachment into the green Belt with sprawling development.		

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Not at present</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>155</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Margaret Carey <b>Clerk</b> <b>Box Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 432813</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 155</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>√</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>√</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b></p>			

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Box	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Not at present		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The Box Parish Council supports the proposals for the new settlement boundary for Box Village.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	156	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Margaret Carey <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Box Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 432813</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 156</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3120509	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	157	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Keith Cockerton <b>Chairman</b>  <b>Collingbourne Ducis Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 157</b>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 858635	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No. The boundaries should not cut properties' gardens in half.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No. Your criterion states "Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement."		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The Council sees the village as a good place to live and it accepts that the employment opportunities it offers are important. The village should be able to grow in future when it is required but should not change the fundamental character of the village. Concern has been expressed that new boundaries give very little room for expansion and if a policy of development of brown field sites is adopted then the village will lose its industry and encourage site owners to develop them for residential use. The proposal seems to contradict the attached letter from Chesterton & Humbert to the council which suggests that Collingbourne Ducis is a large village and being looked at for providing more housing but with these changes there isn't much opportunity for that to be achieved.		

		<p>It is noted that the plan would run to 2026 and if the boundaries are so rigid any change in demand for housing could not be met. I use the example of the Army rebasing in 2020 which has meant major increase in the housing stock at short notice.                  Sunton Meadow and Bourne Meadow should always sit outside any settlement boundaries as they are an integral and historic part of the character of the village.                  We feel that where a precedent has been set i.e. development in a large garden (as in Cadley Road and other specific areas in the village) then the planning officer should make a decision on a case by case basis. A blanket ban could have a significant effect on those properties' market value.                  NB. One councillor agrees completely with the draft proposal.</p>	
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>		3120748	
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	158	<p><b>Consultee:</b>                  Mr                  Jonathan                  Clark  <b>Person ID:</b> 858654</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 158</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>		<p>It is difficult to say since Chippenham isn't included. However very large industrial development shouldn't be allowed to encroach on the green space bewteen Chippenham and local villages.</p>	
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>		<p>If the settlement boundary for Chippenham is the western bypass then yes. The town doesn't need to encroach into the country side when there is plenty of opportunity for development within the current settlement boundary.</p>	
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>		<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p>Chippenham.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>                  Don't know</p>

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The settlement boundary should be the western bypass. Development should not be allowed to extend west from here for houses or industrial units / retail distribution centres.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Until the exact boundary for Chippenham, particularly to the west of the town, is known my involvement in reviewing the settlement boundary is unknown. Currently I am just a concerned local resident.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Chippenham has created a boundary to the west of town with the bypass. Encroachment beyond this, further west, would lead to degradation of the rural aspect and character of the town breaking down the green barrier between the town and nearby villages.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	159	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Karin Elder <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Heywood Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 840457	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 159
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No. Settlement boundaries should be limited to the same criteria as in the West Wilts District Plan showing residential development only. It should exclude all employment use, religious buildings, schools, community halls and all site allocations.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>		Grid reference D5 and E5. This area does not fall within your criterion.	

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Westbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>Heywood Parish Council objects to all proposed extensions save the additional dwelling in D6</p> <p>The 3 categories of extension that Heywood Parish Council does not agree with are</p> <p>Including employment allocations e.g. West Wilts Trading Estate and the proposed Hawke Ridge Business Park within settlement boundaries</p> <p>Modification D5 and E5 as stated previously.</p> <p>Inclusion of Lodgewood Farm (D3,E3) as it is an isolated farm in open countryside.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. Timetable currently unknown.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Heywood Parish Council cannot understand why there are proposals for revised settlement boundaries as the Development Plan Document specifically relates to housing site allocations.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	160	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Susan Findlay <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Ramsbury &amp; Axford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858681	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 160	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	The existing boundaries between the built environment and the open countryside should be retained and we feel that the criteria ensure this.			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	We do consider that the draft settlement boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion and will ensure separation of built environment and open countryside.			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Ramsbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 5/6	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	We would like to request that the area marked red on the enclosed plan is added to the revision of settlement boundary. this piece of land belongs to Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council ( see enclosed documents) and is intended for community use.			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We have decided to postpone a decision on a Neighbourhood Plan until the Core Strategy is published.			

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3121063	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	161	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Susan Findlay <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Ramsbury &amp; Axford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858681	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 161
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The existing boundaries between the built environment and the open countryside should be retained and we feel that the criteria ensure this.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		We do consider that the draft settlement boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion and will ensure separation of built environment and open countryside.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Ramsbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 5/6
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	We would like to request that the area marked red on the enclosed plan is added to the revision of settlement boundary. this piece of land		

<b>proposed change?</b>	belongs to Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council ( see enclosed documents) and is intended for community use.			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We have decided to postpone a decision on a Neighbourhood Plan until the Core Strategy is published.			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>				
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3121063			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	162	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Susan  Findlay <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Ramsbury &amp; Axford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858681                 </td> <td> <b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 162                 </td> </tr> </table>	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Susan  Findlay <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Ramsbury &amp; Axford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858681	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 162
<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Susan  Findlay <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Ramsbury &amp; Axford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 858681	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 162			
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	The existing boundaries between the built environment and the open countryside should be retained and we feel that the criteria ensure this.			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	We do consider that the draft settlement boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion and will ensure separation of built environment and open countryside.			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>	Yes			

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Ramsbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L 5/6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	We would like to request that the area marked red on the enclosed plan is added to the revision of settlement boundary. this piece of land belongs to Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council ( see enclosed documents) and is intended for community use.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	We have decided to postpone a decision on a Neighbourhood Plan until the Core Strategy is published.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3121062		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	163	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Lynda Beaven <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Steeple Ashton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 825520	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 163
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	The criterion seems reasonable.		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Yes, apart from areas identified by Steeple Ashton Parish Council in Q3.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Steeple Ashton Consideration was given to the revised settlement boundaries map and each variation in the existing and proposed boundary was discussed. The variations which Steeple Ashton Parish Council wish to query with Wiltshire Council are as follows.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>J8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Grid Ref: J8 - Back Gardens between Silver Street and the access road to 1, 3 and 5 Edington Road. Why has the proposed line been drawn so close to the rear of the properties? Why not leave it as it was, which would reflect the similar size area of back gardens left inside the settlement boundary for 3, 4 and 5 Home Farm Close (grid ref i8) on the other side of the main Edington Road?</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No neighbourhood plan at this stage.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The paddock directly behind Home Farm Close at the Southern End of the village, appears on the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment. This area is outside of the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore, will the proposed boundary be changed again after the initial review without further consultation? Will the settlement boundary keep changing if further sites are identified? The ongoing process does not appear to be understood. 1.) Where the proposed boundary has been drawn close to a property, does this affect any Permitted Development Rights? 2.) The 'SHLAA Call or sites submission form' is unclear on whether a site which could accommodate only 2 dwellings, but could become available for development within 20 years should be included or not. The following has been extracted from the form: In completing the form please:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use a separate form for each site</li> <li>• complete the form as comprehensively as possible</li> <li>• submit sites that are likely to become available for development or redevelopment in the next 20 years</li> </ul> </p>		

	<p>• submit sites that could accommodate more than five dwellings, and are 0.15 hectares or greater.</p> <p>3. If you are only asking for sites which could accommodate more than 5 dwellings, then by closing in the settlement boundaries in Steeple Ashton, you are effectively discriminating against any small development (less than 5 dwellings) taking place outside or just inside of the proposed boundary. An example of this is grid ref: A3 at the northern end of the village. The proposed settlement boundary has eliminated the possibility of a small scale development with access from Common Hill. However, the owner of the land north of the boundary (i.e. outside the proposed settlement boundary) could submit via the 'SHLAA form' a site big enough for 50 houses. This would appear to be incongruous and discriminatory.</p> <p>4. Does the owner of the land need to submit the 'SHLAA Call for sites submission form' or could the Parish Council identify potential sites without the land owners knowledge? Discussion took place around a site which could possibly accommodate dwellings but would be outside of the proposed boundary. grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement in the same way as the Acreshort Lane recreation field, rather than at the edge of the settlement. The field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement. However, if this goes against the methodology, then it would be useful to understand whether a 'SHLAA call for sites' route is the only way of potentially getting this field included?</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>164</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Lynda Beaven <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Steeple Ashton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 825520</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 164</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The criterion seems reasonable.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b></p>	<p>Yes, apart from areas identified by Steeple Ashton Parish Council in Q3.</p>		

<p><b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Steeple Ashton Consideration was given to the revised settlement boundaries map and each variation in the existing and proposed boundary was discussed. The variations which Steeple Ashton Parish Council wish to query with Wiltshire Council are as follows.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Grid Ref: H8 - The western boundary does not follow a natural line. After the 3 most southerly properties in Acreshort Lane the proposed boundary is brought right in to the roadside. This goes against your methodology of 'Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features such as walls, fences...in order to define the built area of the settlement.' Steeple Ashton parish Council would like consideration to be given to letting the proposed boundary follow the natural line, as it considers that there would be no detriment to the street scene and would not extend the built form of the settlement.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No neighbourhood plan at this stage.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The paddock directly behind Home Farm Close at the Southern End of the village, appears on the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment. This area is outside of the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore, will the proposed boundary be changed again after the initial review without further consultation? Will the settlement boundary keep changing if further sites are identified? The ongoing process does not appear to be understood. 1.) Where the proposed boundary has been drawn close to a property, does this affect any Permitted Development Rights? 2.) The 'SHLAA Call or sites submission form' is unclear on whether a site which could accommodate only 2 dwellings, but could become available for development within 20 years should be included or not. The following has been extracted from the form: In completing the form please:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use a separate form for each site</li> <li>• complete the form as comprehensively as possible</li> <li>• submit sites that are likely to become available for development or redevelopment in the next 20 years</li> <li>• submit sites that could accommodate more than five dwellings, and are 0.15 hectares or greater.</li> </ul> 3. If you are only asking for sites which could accommodate more than 5 dwellings, then by closing in the settlement boundaries in Steeple Ashton, you are effectively discriminating against any small development (less than 5 dwellings) taking place outside or just inside of the</p>		

	<p>proposed boundary. An example of this is grid ref: A3 at the northern end of the village. The proposed settlement boundary has eliminated the possibility of a small scale development with access from Common Hill. However, the owner of the land north of the boundary (i.e. outside the proposed settlement boundary) could submit via the 'SHLAA form' a site big enough for 50 houses. This would appear to be incongruous and discriminatory.</p> <p>4. Does the owner of the land need to submit the 'SHLAA Call for sites submission form' or could the Parish Council identify potential sites without the land owners knowledge? Discussion took place around a site which could possibly accommodate dwellings but would be outside of the proposed boundary. grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement in the same way as the Acreshort Lane recreation field, rather than at the edge of the settlement. The field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement. However, if this goes against the methodology, then it would be useful to understand whether a 'SHLAA call for sites' route is the only way of potentially getting this field included?</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>165</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Lynda Beaven <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Steeple Ashton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 825520</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 165</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>The criterion seems reasonable.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Yes, apart from areas identified by Steeple Ashton Parish Council in Q3.</p>		

<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Steeple Ashton Consideration was given to the revised settlement boundaries map and each variation in the existing and proposed boundary was discussed. The variations which Steeple Ashton Parish Council wish to query with Wiltshire Council are as follows.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H7/i7</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Grid Ref: border of H7/i7 - back Garden of the Longs Arms public house. Why has the pub garden been brought inside the proposed boundary?</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No neighbourhood plan at this stage.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The paddock directly behind Home Farm Close at the Southern End of the village, appears on the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment. This area is outside of the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore, will the proposed boundary be changed again after the initial review without further consultation? Will the settlement boundary keep changing if further sites are identified? The ongoing process does not appear to be understood. 1.) Where the proposed boundary has been drawn close to a property, does this affect any Permitted Development Rights? 2.) The 'SHLAA Call or sites submission form' is unclear on whether a site which could accommodate only 2 dwellings, but could become available for development within 20 years should be included or not. The following has been extracted from the form: In completing the form please:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use a separate form for each site</li> <li>• complete the form as comprehensively as possible</li> <li>• submit sites that are likely to become available for development or redevelopment in the next 20 years</li> <li>• submit sites that could accommodate more than five dwellings, and are 0.15 hectares or greater.</li> </ul> 3. If you are only asking for sites which could accommodate more than 5 dwellings, then by closing in the settlement boundaries in Steeple Ashton, you are effectively discriminating against any small development (less than 5 dwellings) taking place outside or just inside of the proposed boundary. An example of this is grid ref: A3 at the northern end of the village. The proposed settlement boundary has eliminated the possibility of a small scale development with access from Common Hill. However, the owner of the land north of the boundary (i.e. outside the proposed settlement boundary) could submit via the 'SHLAA form' a site big enough for 50 houses. This would appear to be incongruous and discriminatory. 4. Does the owner of the land need to submit the 'SHLAA Call for sites submission form' or could the Parish Council identify potential sites</p>		

		without the land owners knowledge? Discussion took place around a site which could possibly accommodate dwellings but would be outside of the proposed boundary. grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement in the same way as the Acreshort Lane recreation field, rather than at the edge of the settlement. The field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement. However, if this goes against the methodology, then it would be useful to understand whether a 'SHLAA call for sites' route is the only way of potentially getting this field included?	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	166	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Lynda  Beaven <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Steeple Ashton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 825520	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 166
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The criterion seems reasonable.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Yes, apart from areas identified by Steeple Ashton Parish Council in Q3.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Steeple Ashton	

<p><b>name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Consideration was given to the revised settlement boundaries map and each variation in the existing and proposed boundary was discussed. The variations which Steeple Ashton Parish Council wish to query with Wiltshire Council are as follows.</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G4</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Discussion took place around another site which could possibly accommodate dwellings but would be outside of the proposed boundary. Grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement. This field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No neighbourhood plan at this stage.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The paddock directly behind Home Farm Close at the Southern End of the village, appears on the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment. This area is outside of the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore, will the proposed boundary be changed again after the initial review without further consultation? Will the settlement boundary keep changing if further sites are identified? The ongoing process does not appear to be understood. 1.) Where the proposed boundary has been drawn close to a property, does this affect any Permitted Development Rights? 2.) The 'SHLAA Call or sites submission form' is unclear on whether a site which could accommodate only 2 dwellings, but could become available for development within 20 years should be included or not. The following has been extracted from the form: In completing the form please:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use a separate form for each site</li> <li>• complete the form as comprehensively as possible</li> <li>• submit sites that are likely to become available for development or redevelopment in the next 20 years</li> <li>• submit sites that could accommodate more than five dwellings, and are 0.15 hectares or greater.</li> </ul> 3. If you are only asking for sites which could accommodate more than 5 dwellings, then by closing in the settlement boundaries in Steeple Ashton, you are effectively discriminating against any small development (less than 5 dwellings) taking place outside or just inside of the proposed boundary. An example of this is grid ref: A3 at the northern end of the village. The proposed settlement boundary has eliminated the possibility of a small scale development with access from Common Hill. However, the owner of the land north of the boundary (i.e. outside the proposed settlement boundary) could submit via the 'SHLAA form' a site big enough for 50 houses. This would appear to be incongruous and discriminatory. 4. Does the owner of the land need to submit the 'SHLAA Call for sites submission form' or could the Parish Council identify potential sites without the land owners knowledge? Discussion took place around a site which could possibly accommodate dwellings but would be outside of the proposed boundary. grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement in the same way as the Acreshort Lane recreation field, rather than at the edge of the settlement. The</p>		

		field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement. However, if this goes against the methodology, then it would be useful to understand whether a 'SHLAA call for sites' route is the only way of potentially getting this field included?	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	167	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 167
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).</p> <p>Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are:                  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.                  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.                  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p>	

	<p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>F3</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Hawkeridge Business Park allocation area.</p> <p>We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>168</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Amanda Mccann <b>Person ID:</b> 840677</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 168</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>	
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>		<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p>	

<b>criterion?</b>	<p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.                  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Westbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	C4/D4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>West Wilts Trading Estate.                  This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Possibly. Timetable uncertain.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	169	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda Mccann <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 169
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b>	We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).		

<p><b>proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.  There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>

<b>name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	C6/C7etc
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Possibly. Timetable uncertain.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	170	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 170
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p>	

	<p>We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas which have been excluded are:</p> <p>curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p> <p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).</p> <p>We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>C8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Northacre Park allocation area:</p> <p>We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	171	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 171
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).                  Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are:                  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.                  We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.                  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.                  We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.                  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.                  We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.                  Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p>	

	<p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p> <p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).</p> <p>We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:  Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>E6/E7</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>We wish the blue line running along Storridge Road retained with the housing limit solely around this residential area.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>172</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Amanda Mccann <b>Person ID:</b> 840677</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 172</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p>		

<b>criterion?</b>	There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Westbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	E9/D10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	We do not wish allocation sites to be included in the settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Possibly. Timetable uncertain.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	173	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 173
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Areas which have been included are:  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.  Areas which have been excluded are:  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.   recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).   isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).  We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:  Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.   There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b></p>	<p>F8</p>

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		We agree that the five houses on Station Road opposite the Railway Inn should be brought within the settlement boundary.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Possibly. Timetable uncertain.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	174	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 174
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:  Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.	

	<p>site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.                  We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.                  Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p> <p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).                  We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:                  Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.                  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>We consider that the area of open space within the triangle of railway lines should be excluded in accordance with your criterion.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		

<b>timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	175	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 175
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).                  Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are:                  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.                  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.                  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p>	

	<p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G7</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>We consider that the fishing lake south west of Frogmore Lane and all the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and all the land north east of Frogmore Lane should be excluded from the settlement boundary because there are no extant planning permissions on these pieces of land and they are contrary to your criteria.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>176</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Amanda Mccann <b>Person ID:</b> 840677</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 176</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>	
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>		<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p>	

<b>criterion?</b>	There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Westbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	We agree that all the residential development under construction north west of Slag Lane (but not the Network Rail signalling building) should be brought within the settlement boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Possibly. Timetable uncertain.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	177	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 177
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.  There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b></p>	<p>I12/J12</p>

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The allocation site adjacent to Westbury Hospital does not have planning permission. It should be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Possibly. Timetable uncertain.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	178	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 178
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:  Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.	

	<p>site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.                  We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.                  Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p> <p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).                  We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:                  Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.                  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>I13</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Leighton Sports Centre should be entirely excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 1.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		

<b>timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	179	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 179
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).                  Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are:                  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.                  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.                  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p>	

	<p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H14</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>We wish the extension to the settlement boundary at Chalford Gardens to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>180</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Amanda McCann <b>Person ID:</b> 840677</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 180</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate. site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary. Areas which have been excluded are: curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.  recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).  isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>	
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>		<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p>	

<b>criterion?</b>	<p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.                  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.                  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Westbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H15
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	We wish the house that has been added south of Wellhead Drove (Fourways) to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 2.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Possibly. Timetable uncertain.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	181	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 181
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>	We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:		

<p><b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Areas which have been included are:  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.  We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.  Areas which have been excluded are:  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.   recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).   isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).  We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:  Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.   There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.  Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.  Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b></p>	<p>F14/F15</p>

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		We wish the premises known as Courtleigh to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Possibly. Timetable uncertain.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	182	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 182
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park). Dealing with specific criteria:  Areas which have been included are: both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement. We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary. existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement. We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.	

	<p>site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.          We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.          Areas which have been excluded are:          curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p> <p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).          We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at:          Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.          Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.          Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.          Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>D13/D14</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Westbury Leigh Primary School should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		

<b>timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	183	<b>Consultee:</b> Amanda  Mccann  <b>Person ID:</b> 840677	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 183
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).                  Dealing with specific criteria:</p> <p>Areas which have been included are:                  both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.                  existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.                  site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.</p> <p>We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas which have been excluded are:                  curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.</p> <p>recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).</p>	

	<p>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations). We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>You have not followed your own criteria at: Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</p> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development. Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three. Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Westbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>D13</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The White Horse Health Centre should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Possibly. Timetable uncertain.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	184	<b>Consultee:</b> Miss Helen Sutton  <b>Person ID:</b> 858807	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 184	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>				
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Chippenham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>				
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		As a resident of. Acacia Close, Cepen Park North, I strongly oppose the Boundary to the west of the A350 to be, Used for Retail, and Industrial Development, this will cause untold damage to our surrounding countryside and wildlife. The Settlement Boundary Review Informal Consultation with Parish and Town Councils ends on Monday 22 September , It does not		

		include anything about Chippenham which will have its own Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD). At the presentation held in the Neeld Hall in June regarding the future development of Chippenham, Wiltshire Council had ruled out building to the west of the A350.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	185	<b>Consultee:</b> Cllr  Horace  Prickett <b>Councillor</b>  <b>Wiltshire Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 830542	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 185
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No Comment	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No Comment	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	North Bradley	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	North bradley Parish Council does not seek any modifications.		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		North bradley P.C. are currently considering the question of Neighbourhood Plans and whether to generate one for the parish. These discussions are only just beginning and thus no date for completion of the work can be given.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		North Bradley P.C. is open to consideration of moderate allocation sites but would wish but would wish to learn of possible developments from developers before commenting.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	186	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Sally Simms <b>Person ID:</b> 858824	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 186
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>	Chippenham		

<b>name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>Dear Sir,          As a Chippenham resident, aware of The Settlement Boundary Review Informal Consultation with Parish and Town Councils ending on Monday 22 September, it does not include anything about Chippenham which has its own Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD). At the presentation held in the Neeld Hall in June regarding the future development of Chippenham, Wiltshire Council had ruled out building to the west of the A350.          living at The Cepen Park North area of Chippenham I strongly oppose any such Retail Development on existing countryside adjacent to the A350 highlighting the need to keep this natural boundary for the west of the town.          Yours sincerely          Sally Simms</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	187	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Sally Hoddinott <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Potterne Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 840732</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 187</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>The Alterations in teh boundary of the village further restricts any possible in-fill development. We presume from this, that the village will not be expected to take further development in the lifetime of the structure plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Potterne</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Yes April 2015</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>No</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	188	<b>Consultee:</b> S+J OFM  <b>Person ID:</b> 858632	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 188
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>No.</p> <p>The criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries is not the correct one to use. How was the criterion decided upon? We have seen that the only other consultation about boundaries was the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 which was held from March to June 2014, we presume that these criterions were collated following this DPD Reg 18 consultation?</p> <p>If this is the case, then the criterion does not seem to reflect the views of the 300 odd consultees; are they aware of this current consultation as there doesn't appear to be as many responses this time? We were not aware of the DPD Reg 18 consultation so were not able to provide a response. How was it advertised?</p> <p>As we have submitted a planning application recently, within the last 12 months, we are surprised that we were not contacted as our details are known by the West Wiltshire planning dept. We would have welcomed the opportunity to have contributed to the March consultation had we have known about it.</p> <p>Have other planning applicants been notified about these boundary consultations, as boundary issues affect most planning applications that have been submitted recently? The current batch of landowners who are submitting planning apps represent the current source of 'available' land which will be providing the land supply over the next 3-5 years, so their views must be sought also.</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>No.</p> <p>The review of settlement boundaries is a serious issue as it will affect housing development for the next 30 years, it should not be rushed. We broadly welcome that this review is taking place as the Sutton Veny boundary is grossly outdated compared with the current level of the established built environment. The proposed Sutton Veny boundary should be moved to encompass all of the dwellings that the village contains, without prejudice to any existing dwelling.</p> <p>Over three quarters of the village is still missing from your proposed boundary for Sutton Veny. If you were applying your criterion it would have incorporated ALL of the dwellings in the village not just the central ones which were ring-fenced in the original boundary line during the 1990's. The Conservation Area boundary, which is also out of date [originally 'drawn' in the 1970's], has never been publically consulted on or reviewed since. This also needs to be reviewed and fully consulted on with residents and landowners of Sutton Veny.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary should be the new proposed Settlement Boundary as it effectively encompasses all of Sutton Veny' settlement dwellings and more accurately reflects the real 'settlement area' of the village. The out-of-date 1970's Settlement Boundary should then become the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary as it encapsulates the historical heart of the village, which is what a CA boundary should do. In fact, if you look at all the other conservation areas in Wiltshire they are generally far smaller than the settlement boundary, so why is Sutton Veny's Conservation Area grossly over proportioned?</p> <p>The 20 year Impact of Wiltshire Settlement Boundary Policy Constraints has seen a decline in ALL types of planning permissions as land within the 1990's outdated boundary has been exhausted. The only option for Sutton Veny is to return to the natural sustainable growth pattern pre-1990's which encouraged sustainable development in equal measure inside and outside the current 1990's outdated boundary. Please see attached document which provides an overview of Sutton Veny historical growth patterns to illustrate the above points.</p> <p>DOCUMENT UPLOADED: Sutton Veny's Population Growth 1801-2011 Compared with Historical Planning Applications 1980-2014</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>	Yes		

<p><b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Your Proposed Map Grid Reference: Sutton Veny G5-G6 National Grid Reference 389580E, 142180N 2 DOCUMENTS UPLOADED: G5-G6 SITE LOCATION PLAN G5-G6 Sutton Veny Identified Site Sept2014</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G5 and G6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Please review the land at Grid Reference G5+G6 as this is a vacant brownfield site that has the potential to be sustainable, suitable, available, achievable and deliverable. The site is constrained by the out-dated settlement boundary. It is well related to the village, surrounded by residential dwellings and is adjacent of the outdated boundary. It would form a natural growth extension as it is already a part of the village infrastructure, located within 150 metres of bus stops and 300 metres from employment centre Longbridge Deverill Trading Estate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No – Sutton Veny Parish Council do not appear to be undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan but they have just started a Housing Needs Survey to identify the level of Housing Need in the village [Expected timetable: Sept 2014 – Feb 2014]. The last Housing Needs Survey was conducted in 2005 and 8 affordable and intermediate dwellings were identified as being needed. Unfortunately, despite this evidence, no proactive response to this identified need was achieved so no Affordable or Intermediate housing was provided in Sutton Veny between 2006-2014. The 2011 Census indicates that 13 householders currently living in Sutton Veny are living in overcrowded dwellings. In December 2013, following a FOI request, 10 households were on the Wiltshire Housing Register for affordable + intermediate housing in Sutton Veny; September 2014 there are now 12 households that are in housing need on the Housing Register: an increase of 4 households in 9 years but an increase of 2 households in just 9 months.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 consultation and this current Settlement Boundary consultation were not widely advertised and we have only just been alerted about them 10 days ago by a couple of our neighbours. We have noted that other sites that have been submitted via the SHLAA document have not been added to the proposed boundaries despite being fully assessed as sustainable sites. This raises concerns that sites highlighted via this consultation will be prejudiced against and not assessed in accordance with the NPPF PPG's and in light of the Examining Inspectors 10 th Procedural letter. We don't fully understand why existing planning applications that are either going through the planning system or those that have been granted permission, are equally missing off the proposed boundary maps. Perhaps this is due to applicants not being advised that this consultation is happening? Could you log these concerns and investigate why planning applicants have been overlooked in this consultation process, is it the result of an administrative error or a procedural oversight?</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b></p>	<p>3123926</p>		

answers			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	189	<b>Consultee:</b> S+J OFM  <b>Person ID:</b> 858632	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 189
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>No.</p> <p>The criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries is not the correct one to use. How was the criterion decided upon? We have seen that the only other consultation about boundaries was the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 which was held from March to June 2014, we presume that these criterions were collated following this DPD Reg 18 consultation?</p> <p>If this is the case, then the criterion does not seem to reflect the views of the 300 odd consultees; are they aware of this current consultation as there doesn't appear to be as many responses this time? We were not aware of the DPD Reg 18 consultation so were not able to provide a response. How was it advertised?</p> <p>As we have submitted a planning application recently, within the last 12 months, we are surprised that we were not contacted as our details are known by the West Wiltshire planning dept. We would have welcomed the opportunity to have contributed to the March consultation had we have known about it.</p> <p>Have other planning applicants been notified about these boundary consultations, as boundary issues affect most planning applications that have been submitted recently? The current batch of landowners who are submitting planning apps represent the current source of 'available' land which will be providing the land supply over the next 3-5 years, so their views must be sought also.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		<p>No.</p> <p>The review of settlement boundaries is a serious issue as it will affect housing development for the next 30 years, it should not be rushed. We broadly welcome that this review is taking place as the Sutton Veny boundary is grossly outdated compared with the current level of the established built environment. The proposed Sutton Veny boundary should be moved to encompass all of the dwellings that the village contains, without prejudice to any existing dwelling.</p> <p>Over three quarters of the village is still missing from your proposed boundary for Sutton Veny. If you were applying your criterion it would have incorporated ALL of the dwellings in the village not just the central ones which were ring-fenced in the original boundary line during the 1990's. The Conservation Area boundary, which is also out of date [originally 'drawn' in the 1970's], has never been publically consulted on or reviewed since. This also needs to be reviewed and fully consulted on with residents and landowners of Sutton Veny.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary should be the new proposed Settlement Boundary as it effectively encompasses all of Sutton Veny' settlement dwellings and more accurately reflects the real 'settlement area' of the village. The out-of-date</p>	

	<p>1970's Settlement Boundary should then become the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary as it encapsulates the historical heart of the village, which is what a CA boundary should do. In fact, if you look at all the other conservation areas in Wiltshire they are generally far smaller than the settlement boundary, so why is Sutton Veny's Conservation Area grossly over proportioned?</p> <p>The 20 year Impact of Wiltshire Settlement Boundary Policy Constraints has seen a decline in ALL types of planning permissions as land within the 1990's outdated boundary has been exhausted. The only option for Sutton Veny is to return to the natural sustainable growth pattern pre-1990's which encouraged sustainable development in equal measure inside and outside the current 1990's outdated boundary.</p> <p>Please see attached document which provides an overview of Sutton Veny historical growth patterns to illustrate the above points.</p> <p>DOCUMENT UPLOADED: Sutton Veny's Population Growth 1801-2011 Compared with Historical Planning Applications 1980-2014</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Your Proposed Map Grid Reference: Sutton Veny G5-G6 National Grid Reference 389580E, 142180N</p> <p>2 DOCUMENTS UPLOADED: G5-G6 SITE LOCATION PLAN G5-G6 Sutton Veny Identified Site Sept2014</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G5 and G6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Please review the land at Grid Reference G5+G6 as this is a vacant brownfield site that has the potential to be sustainable, suitable, available, achievable and deliverable. The site is constrained by the out-dated settlement boundary. It is well related to the village, surrounded by residential dwellings and is adjacent of the outdated boundary. It would form a natural growth extension as it is already a part of the village infrastructure, located within 150 metres of bus stops and 300 metres from employment centre Longbridge Deverill Trading Estate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No – Sutton Veny Parish Council do not appear to be undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan but they have just started a Housing Needs Survey to identify the level of Housing Need in the village [Expected timetable: Sept 2014 – Feb 2014].</p> <p>The last Housing Needs Survey was conducted in 2005 and 8 affordable and intermediate dwellings were identified as being needed. Unfortunately, despite this evidence, no proactive response to this identified need was achieved so no Affordable or Intermediate housing was provided in Sutton Veny between 2006-2014.</p> <p>The 2011 Census indicates that 13 householders currently living in Sutton Veny are living in overcrowded dwellings. In December 2013, following a FOI request, 10 households were on the Wiltshire Housing Register for affordable + intermediate housing in Sutton Veny; September 2014 there are now 12 households that are in housing need on the Housing Register: an increase of 4 households in 9 years but an increase of 2 households in just 9 months.</p>		

<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 consultation and this current Settlement Boundary consultation were not widely advertised and we have only just been alerted about them 10 days ago by a couple of our neighbours.          We have noted that other sites that have been submitted via the SHLAA document have not been added to the proposed boundaries despite being fully assessed as sustainable sites.          This raises concerns that sites highlighted via this consultation will be prejudiced against and not assessed in accordance with the NPPF PPG's and in light of the Examining Inspectors 10 th Procedural letter.          We don't fully understand why existing planning applications that are either going through the planning system or those that have been granted permission, are equally missing off the proposed boundary maps. Perhaps this is due to applicants not being advised that this consultation is happening?          Could you log these concerns and investigate why planning applicants have been overlooked in this consultation process, is it the result of an administrative error or a procedural oversight?</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3123929</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>190</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> S+J OFM  <b>Person ID:</b> 858632</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 190</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries is not the correct one to use. How was the criterion decided upon? We have seen that the only other consultation about boundaries was the Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 which was held from March to June 2014, we presume that these criterions were collated following this DPD Reg 18 consultation?</p> <p>If this is the case, then the criterion does not seem to reflect the views of the 300 odd consultees; are they aware of this current consultation as there doesn't appear to be as many responses this time? We were not aware of the DPD Reg 18 consultation so were not able to provide a response. How was it advertised?</p> <p>As we have submitted a planning application recently, within the last 12 months, we are surprised that we were not contacted as our details are known by the West Wiltshire planning dept. We would have welcomed the opportunity to have contributed to the March consultation had we have known about it.</p> <p>Have other planning applicants been notified about these boundary consultations, as boundary issues affect most planning applications that have been submitted recently? The current batch of landowners who are submitting planning apps represent the current source of</p>		

<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>'available' land which will be providing the land supply over the next 3-5 years, so their views must be sought also.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>The review of settlement boundaries is a serious issue as it will affect housing development for the next 30 years, it should not be rushed. We broadly welcome that this review is taking place as the Sutton Veny boundary is grossly outdated compared with the current level of the established built environment. The proposed Sutton Veny boundary should be moved to encompass all of the dwellings that the village contains, without prejudice to any existing dwelling.</p> <p>Over three quarters of the village is still missing from your proposed boundary for Sutton Veny. If you were applying your criterion it would have incorporated ALL of the dwellings in the village not just the central ones which were ring-fenced in the original boundary line during the 1990's. The Conservation Area boundary, which is also out of date [originally 'drawn' in the 1970's], has never been publically consulted on or reviewed since. This also needs to be reviewed and fully consulted on with residents and landowners of Sutton Veny.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary should be the new proposed Settlement Boundary as it effectively encompasses all of Sutton Veny' settlement dwellings and more accurately reflects the real 'settlement area' of the village. The out-of-date 1970's Settlement Boundary should then become the Sutton Veny Conservation Area boundary as it encapsulates the historical heart of the village, which is what a CA boundary should do. In fact, if you look at all the other conservation areas in Wiltshire they are generally far smaller than the settlement boundary, so why is Sutton Veny's Conservation Area grossly over proportioned?</p> <p>The 20 year Impact of Wiltshire Settlement Boundary Policy Constraints has seen a decline in ALL types of planning permissions as land within the 1990's outdated boundary has been exhausted. The only option for Sutton Veny is to return to the natural sustainable growth pattern pre-1990's which encouraged sustainable development in equal measure inside and outside the current 1990's outdated boundary.</p> <p>Please see attached document which provides an overview of Sutton Veny historical growth patterns to illustrate the above points.</p> <p>DOCUMENT UPLOADED: Sutton Veny's Population Growth 1801-2011 Compared with Historical Planning Applications 1980-2014</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Your Proposed Map Grid Reference: Sutton Veny G5-G6 National Grid Reference 389580E, 142180N</p> <p>2 DOCUMENTS UPLOADED: G5-G6 SITE LOCATION PLAN</p> <p style="text-align: right;">G5-G6</p> <p>Sutton Veny Identified Site Sept2014</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>G5 and G6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your</b></p>	<p>Please review the land at Grid Reference G5+G6 as this is a vacant brownfield site that has the potential to be sustainable, suitable,</p>		

<p><b>proposed change?</b></p>	<p>available, achievable and deliverable. The site is constrained by the out-dated settlement boundary. It is well related to the village, surrounded by residential dwellings and is adjacent of the outdated boundary. It would form a natural growth extension as it is already a part of the village infrastructure, located within 150 metres of bus stops and 300 metres from employment centre Longbridge Deverill Trading Estate.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>No – Sutton Veny Parish Council do not appear to be undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan but they have just started a Housing Needs Survey to identify the level of Housing Need in the village [Expected timetable: Sept 2014 – Feb 2014].</p> <p>The last Housing Needs Survey was conducted in 2005 and 8 affordable and intermediate dwellings were identified as being needed. Unfortunately, despite this evidence, no proactive response to this identified need was achieved so no Affordable or Intermediate housing was provided in Sutton Veny between 2006-2014.</p> <p>The 2011 Census indicates that 13 householders currently living in Sutton Veny are living in overcrowded dwellings.</p> <p>In December 2013, following a FOI request, 10 households were on the Wiltshire Housing Register for affordable + intermediate housing in Sutton Veny;</p> <p>September 2014 there are now 12 households that are in housing need on the Housing Register: an increase of 4 households in 9 years but an increase of 2 households in just 9 months.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 consultation and this current Settlement Boundary consultation were not widely advertised and we have only just been alerted about them 10 days ago by a couple of our neighbours.</p> <p>We have noted that other sites that have been submitted via the SHLAA document have not been added to the proposed boundaries despite being fully assessed as sustainable sites.</p> <p>This raises concerns that sites highlighted via this consultation will be prejudiced against and not assessed in accordance with the NPPF PPG's and in light of the Examining Inspectors 10 th Procedural letter.</p> <p>We don't fully understand why existing planning applications that are either going through the planning system or those that have been granted permission, are equally missing off the proposed boundary maps. Perhaps this is due to applicants not being advised that this consultation is happening?</p> <p>Could you log these concerns and investigate why planning applicants have been overlooked in this consultation process, is it the result of an administrative error or a procedural oversight?</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3166927</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>191</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Gary  Brain <b>Member</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 191</p>

		<b>Colerne Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 856295</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Additional Settlement Boundary		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>	3124359		

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	192	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Gary Brain <b>Member</b>  <b>Colerne Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 856295	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 192
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?		Colerne Planning Minutes 09/09/2014	
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers		3124358	
Comment ID:	193	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Carly Lovell <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Tidworth Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 407444</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 193</b>
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?		Yes	
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?		Yes	
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?		No	
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:	Tidworth	Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		No changes req'd	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		No	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		At the moment Tidworth includes the area of Perham Down which has not been included within this boundary assessment on the grounds that Perham Down is a settlement in its own right. This will mean that this area is not being considered by a responsible council authority and therefore not correctly assessed. For all future assessments Perham Down & Tidworth should be considered as a single boundary entity as it falls within a single Town Council responsibility.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	194	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr John B B Clee <b>Planning Officer</b>  <b>Bulford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 445483</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 194</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b>			

<p><b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>1. I attach Bulford Parish Council's response to this consultation. In view of the urgency, I am attaching it to this e-mail, together with a map (showing the proposed Settlement Boundary) that is done to the best of my ability.</p> <p>2. Some of the text notes on the map may be too small to read, but, where this is so, they can be read on a computer by enlarging the area in question.</p> <p>3. I apologise for the lateness of this (Tue 23 Sep being the deadline), but, firstly, I had to table the matter in a Council Meeting, secondly, scanning even a cut-down version of County's original very large map presented a real problem, and, thirdly, the whole business was even further delayed by severe computer difficulties following a complete collapse !</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3124430</p>		

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>195</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr John B B Clee <b>Planning Officer</b>  <b>Bulford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 445483</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 195</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>				
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>				
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>				
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>				
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>				

**Reference : Discussions with Manager Spatial Planning (Mr Geoff Winslow) and with Manager Planning South (Mr Andrew Guest), as well as discussion with DCOS HQ TNB Garrison and SO1 MCI HQ 43 (Wessex) Brigade**

1. I am instructed by Council to say that :-
  - a. Council's submission is made without cognisance of or reference to current land ownership.
  - b. It is considered that it is a contradiction in terms to establish a Settlement (Development) Boundary around a settlement that omits areas of significant development within the Parish that cannot be described by any stretch of the imagination as areas of "undeveloped countryside".
  - c. Whilst the reason for excluding "houses with large gardens" from the Development Area is fully understood ( primarily to prevent future development of such gardens) and is supported by this Council, it makes little sense to exclude groups of such houses. A single large house with a large garden may well not affect the overall undeveloped appearance of the surrounding countryside but a group of such houses most certainly does. Moreover, where such a group exists, other planning restrictions and material considerations would also exist to prevent garden development (*inter alia* Building Line springs to mind) that might well not apply to a single dwelling.
  - d. Whilst the exclusion from the Settlement Area of pure military development "within the wire" (where occupancy is solely uniformed personnel or where buildings have no residential occupancy) is supported, the exclusion of MOD Married Quarters (which are residential development where the occupants have civilian status) is not. Under the MOD NEM policy, this residency will be of a near permanent nature with little (or indeed, any) more volatility than houses of a purely civilian origin; moreover, it is essential that these MOD families are now integrated into the Parish community and anything which sets them apart, or which does anything to encourage the "them and us" attitudes that have prevailed for so many years, must be avoided at all costs.
  - e. Lastly, it makes little sense to this Council to establish a Settlement (Development) Boundary so tightly that there would be no possibility of "Infill" in the future. This Parish, must moderately and sensibly expand or eventually die, and any Settlement Boundary (outside of which development would be excluded, except under exceptional circumstances) must be drawn in such a way as to allow this as opportunity presents itself. To forestall comment that this concept is better dealt with by means of a Parish Plan, it must be said that, as a result of qualified, professional advice, this Council has concluded and Resolved that such a Plan is not a practical possibility in this Parish; therefore, Council does not have this alternative to fall back on.

2. Taking these principles into account, Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include :-
  - a. The existing MOD Canadian Estate, together with the proposed new Married Quarter estate under Army Re-basing (as approved by the Strategic Planning Committee).
  - b. The significant and grouped developments consisting of "The Dovecot" and "Watergate House" that lie further to the West along Watergate Lane; this would allow for some "Infill" along Watergate Lane between the existing dwellings.
  - c. The very significant development consisting of Bulford Manor, Manor farm and a number of residential houses in the same small area, together with the two substantial residential houses to the north at the north end of Church Lane; this would allow for possible "Infill" along the west side of Church Lane in the years to come (the area to the east of Church Lane is an agricultural tenancy).
  - d. The four grouped houses (Old Vicarage, Amiens, Mons, Arras Houses - the last three being MOD Married Quarters) and the quite heavy development lying on the east side of the Milston Road; this would permit very suitable "Infill" along the east side of the Milston Road (should the opportunity arise) particularly if the boundary is extended to the natural line of the east-west farm track further to the north. Whilst the four houses mentioned above have comparatively large gardens, it is considered that, as a group they constitute substantial development which can not be logically excluded, whilst development of the gardens would not be permitted for a variety of good planning

**Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?**

	<p>Material Considerations.</p> <p>e. The area lying to the north of The Bulford Drove way (between Vicarage Corner and the Pumping Station which would form an extension of the building line already formed by the four houses named in sub-para d. above; this area would be entirely suitable for development, should the opportunity arise. It should be noted that the area lying to the south of his stretch of road consists of a Water Meadow and a Parish Recreation Ground (and a stretch of the Nine Mile River itself).</p> <p>f. In addition to the above, Council is of the view that it would be entirely logical to draw the boundary so as to permit development by extending the building line along the west side of the road opposite the Rose &amp; Crown Public House, the Working Men's Club and the Avondale School.</p> <p>3. It is appreciated that this adjusted Settlement Boundary would be entirely irregular in shape, but it would nevertheless be a continuous and contained area that would conform to the principles outlined in para 1. One other group of residential houses lies within this Parish, namely the development at Sling which lies to the east and is separated by the wired area of the Army Camp itself; whilst it would be entirely logical to include this within the Parish Settlement Boundary, inclusion would require a separate and stand alone boundary which Council does not consider to be practical.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3124429</p>

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>196</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms. Beccy Santhouse <b>Person ID:</b> 858947</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 196</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>			

<b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sutton Veny	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Please could you not remove our office from inside the boundaries since this does not fit the criterion of employment use. To ensure transparency in the decision making process, please inform us of why it was proposed to remove it in the first place.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3124568		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	197	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  R P  Coleman <b>Dilton Marsh Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 197

		<b>Person ID:</b> 391586	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	The new 'settlement line' is drawn through (and bisects) the gardens in a number of instances. For example, some at Stormore (Grid Reference F7) have more of their gardens included now whereas others, such as Shepherds Mead (Grid Reference F6) have less. A similar situation is evident in Petticoat Lane (Grid Reference K7 and L7). This appears perverse.	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	L6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The Parish Council resolved that the Bullivant Site (Grid Reference L6) should remain OUTSIDE the Settlement Boundary – as at present.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any</b>	No.		

<b>additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	198	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Nicola  Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 198</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury & West Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Why has the boundary excluded 'Applewell' which is clearly marked on the map.		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	199	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Nicola  Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 199</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft</b>		Yes	

<b>settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury and West Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Including the playing fields will cause consternation and sends a poor message.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	200	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Nicola Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 200</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct</b>	No.		

<b>ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury and West Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	All
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Existing boundaries should be left unchanged until outcome of the Neighbourhood Planning.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	201	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Nicola Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 201

		<b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	We object to the exclusion of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement – this is positive to the small developer – we support opportunities for small (rural) developments in preference to large bolt-on estate.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	202	<b>Consultee:</b> Dominic Hickey <b>Person ID:</b> 858954	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 202
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The current boundary incorporates part but not all of my garden in Spring Valley in the Bottom on the north side of the village. The revised boundary cuts this down so that the boundary takes in the house only and excludes the garden. I am not clear on the implications of the	

		boundary (and would like to see an explanation) however it seems extraordinary to me that houses and their gardens should be divided by a boundary. There is an extraordinary bite taken out of the boundary on the north side of the village, which includes my garden, whereas the more sensible approach would seem to be that the appropriate dividing line should be the footpath that runs up the north side of spring valley. The postcode for reference is SN10 4SD.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	203	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Nicola  Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 203</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The CCWWD AONB has not been cross-referenced to the draft settlement boundaries and should be included in the criteria.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	204	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Nicola Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 204</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>			

criterion?			
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?			
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?	Allocated sites should not automatically be included without further consultation with the local community.		
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	205	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Nicola Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 467567</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 205</b>
Question 1 - Do you consider			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Extant planning permissions which are not supported by the local community should not automatically be included in the settlement boundary without further local consultation and agreement.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	206	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Nicola  Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 467567	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 206	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>				
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>				
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Yes - min. 12 months		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Criteria are inconsistent with encouraging small developments suitable for a rural area e.g. they militate against the re-use of dilapidated farm sites, which is a core element of our neighbourhood plan proposals – enabling affordable quality housing for rural business workers (e.g. Ley Farm- between Teffont and Tisbury – this is good reuse of old buildings and Place Farm in Tisbury).	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	207	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  R J  Bean  <b>Person ID:</b> 858959	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 207
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>			

<p><b>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Re: Alcludia, The Ham, Urchfont, DEVIZES, Wiltshire, SN10 4SG</p> <p>I have been informed, by a friend, this weekend that Wiltshire County Council are proposing that the village boundary for Urchfont is revised and that, My wife and I, being the owners of Alcludia, have until the 23 rd September 2014 to make responses regarding these village boundary proposals.</p> <p>Please will you modify the suggested new boundary to include our entire garden. Please see attached a copy of a drawing which is based on the details provided on the Ordnance Survey Map dated 1982. On the original map our property is wrongly identified as "Arcadia" it should be Alcludia. I have identified the boundary of our property in red.</p> <p>Urchfont is a lovely village and a very friendly community to live in. Over fifty years ago my wife's parents lived very happily in the village. Whilst they lived here we visited them frequently and quickly appreciated what a pleasant place it is to live. We have, and still are, living very happily in our home ever since we were fortunate to purchase the land and have our home built in 1977. Our two sons had very happy childhoods here.</p> <p>Our garden has previously been within the village boundary. Virtually none of our garden can be seen from any public road, pathway or any view point. Very few people in Urchfont have ever seen the land at the bottom of our garden. Only two of our neighbours have any sight of it.</p> <p>My wife and I are now moving into old age and I no longer enjoy good health. Sometime in the future it will be very nice if we can have built in our garden (with planning permission being granted) a property which hopefully one of our sons, daughter in-law and children will move into. That would bring a young family back in the village, the grand children would enjoy growing up here in this pleasant and safe environment and my wife and I are likely to live independently longer in our village knowing that we have family nearby.</p> <p>Before we had our home built, there had been number dwellings at the Ham and also near the stream in the garden of our neighbours to the north of us in the house which is now named Hazeledene.</p> <p>Many of our neighbours have extended their homes considerably during the time that we have lived in Urchfont and looking at the map of the suggested new village boundary it is apparent that the entire garden of most of the properties are fully included within the proposed revised boundary.</p> <p>Please may we request that the revised village boundary is moved to the north and West, as it was previously, so that our entire garden is within it. It appears to me that it would be better if was moved so that it runs along the footpath known as 'The Bash' from Rose Cottage at the East, to the bottom of the garden of the property at the West which was known as 'Gay Look' (as marked on the attached drawing in</p>

		<p>green) so that it joins up with the rest of the proposed boundary. Hence all of our garden and also all of Hazeldene's garden. (Marked on the drawing as 'Spring Valley') is included.</p> <p>Please accept my apology if I have inadvertently used wrong terminology as due to the pressure of time I have been unable to have this message checked for errors.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3124587 (map)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	208	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Paul Morrison <b>Person ID:</b> 858964	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 208
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>			

<b>proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>As owner residents of The Croft, Stockley Lane, Calne, we have been studying your DPD "Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries".</p> <p>We are concerned that the map, showing the proposed revision to settlement boundary completely bisects our garden and property. The house is marked to be within the proposed revised settlement boundary, whereas the driveway and majority of our garden appears to lie outside of the possible revised boundary. Clearly there are implications if this new boundary is ratified and we request clarification on the matter.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council DPD, states under Draft Methodology on page 3 that areas excluded from the review process are:- "curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens."</p> <p>We assume this is the reason why the boundary for The Croft has been marked as detailed on the map. However why isn't Quemerford House treated in the same way because it shows that the garden <u>and</u> the house are all outside the proposed settlement boundary?</p> <p>We request clarification on this matter, since our property and garden currently lies within the existing settlement boundary. It would be unacceptable for an arbitrary boundary decision to be made, which leaves our property in one region and our garden under the jurisdiction of another.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3124596 (letter)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	209	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms  Nicola  Duke <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Tisbury Parish Council</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 209</b>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 467567	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Criterion related to the exclusion of recreational or amenity space is most unclear – if these areas are to be excluded, why have you included the future wildflower meadow at G5? And the King George V playing fields which are protected?		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	210	<b>Consultee:</b> Captain Alan Evans <b>Person ID:</b> 858968	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 210
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any</b>		It has just come to my attention (at the latest possible time) that it is the Authorities intention to unilaterally move the settlement boundaries	

<p><b>additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>in this area, thereby 'shifting' my property into the 'Calne Town' and out of the 'Calne Without' settlement area.</p> <p>It would appear that the Wiltshire Council is working on the assumption that, as elected representatives, both area Councils are qualified to make these decisions despite making no representations to the owners of the six properties involved. Indeed, it is wrongly stated that these Councils "have detailed knowledge of their local area," when this is far from the truth.</p> <p>Does the Council consider that if Mr. Alex Salmond and his elected political party had unilaterally decided to move Scotland out of the United Kingdom, using the justification that they "have detailed knowledge of Scotland" it would have been a democratic decision? I think not!</p> <p>I have had sight of a plan which incorrectly delineates my property as already being within the 'Calne Town Settlement Area' and so I would appreciate it if you could correct this anomaly at the soonest until the necessary discussions have been incepted, completed and the boundary position democratically agreed.</p> <p>In future, as a substantial local ratepayer, I insist that, going forward, I am involved in such major discussions and decisions and as such your thoughts would be much appreciated / demanded at the soonest.</p> <p>The regional Council and its various planning departments have run 'roughshod' over this area of Calne for much of the past two decades and it is time for this to stop. Remember, you are employed in the capacity of our servants and so I would appreciate it if you would act as such.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>211</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Carol Hackett <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Market Lavington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 389494</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 211</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b></p>			

<p><b>proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Market Lavington</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>On behalf of Market Lavington the Parish Council makes the following comments on Wiltshire’s Councils Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries.</p> <p>1 The draft Proposed Settlement Boundary for Market Lavington contains within the defined settlement area the open wooded space known as Canada Wood (Reference G6, H6 and H5 on the MAP 100049050,20140) This wooded area is a valuable open village space and should be outside the Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>2 The Parish Council has been asked to agree to the proposed process for defining new settlement boundaries by 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014. The Parish Council is not able to support or agree to these proposals and wishes to register its objections to the process adopted by Wiltshire Council. Our reasons are stated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft proposal showing a settlement boundary drawn around the existing village centre and surrounding buildings, was presented Wiltshire’s planners in July 2014. The Parish Council is also aware that currently a number of developers are preparing plans for new housing developments in the village outside this proposed boundary. The Parish Council cannot</li> </ul>		

	<p>therefore, by implication, agree to a settlement boundary in the knowledge that it will be incorrect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Parish Council is aware that under the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy, Wiltshire Council intend to develop a significant number of new houses within the Parish. As, currently, Wiltshire Council have not indicated how many new dwellings will be allocated to Market Lavington nor where they will be built the Parish Council is not able to have any meaningful consultation with the community regarding future development in the Parish and without such consultation is unable to agree to any new settlement boundaries for the village.</li> </ul> <p>The Parish Council is of the opinion that any future development within the Parish must recognise and take account of existing village issues, such as traffic congestion, limited parking, inadequate public transport, and assistance to maintain and encourage the village's role as a local service centre. The Parish Council has twice requested a meeting with Wiltshire Planners to discuss these issues as part of the process for development planning and agreeing settlement boundaries. There has been no response to these requests.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3124601 (letter)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>212</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Bob Lunn <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Urchfont Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 398000</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 212</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No.</p>		

<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Yes. December 2014.	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>Urchfont Parish Council voted unanimously at their meeting on 10 th Setpember 2014 to accept thus proposed Boundary following advice from the Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group who have walked the Parish to produce this review.</p> <p>The Parish Council and NP Steering Group also support the principle of the Boundary being on the north side of the B3098.</p> <p>Please note that the grid references quoted in Section C are those shown on the Draft Proposals sent out by WC (see attached), they are not shown on the revised proposal made by the Parish Council (also attached) but comparison of the two will facaiiatae identification of changes.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3124624 (maps)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	213	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Christina Musselwhite <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Great Wishford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 848456</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 213</b>

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Great Wishford	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting</b>			

<b>documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	214	<b>Consultee:</b> Bradford on Avon Town Council <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Bradford on Avon Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 467835	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 214
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>1.1 We consider that the methodology while generally appropriate omits key features of the natural environment. We suggest that the list of criteria should be amended to 'include consideration of landscape and biodiversity features that relate to the countryside, including those that are protected through policy and under the NERC Act*. Bradford on Avon has important features such as the River Avon, woodland and orchards that have a strong relationship in landscape and Biodiversity terms to the Countryside and therefore should be excluded. This criterion would be relevant for all settlements and not just Bradford on Avon:</p> <p><b>The criteria for the Areas to be Excluded from the Settlement Boundary should be amended include the following additional criterion:</b>                  EXCLUDING <i>'Landscape features and habitats at the edge of settlements that relate to the countryside.</i>  <b>Subject to the inclusion of this criterion, we are in agreement with the proposed methodology.</b></p> <p><b><i>*The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 requires all public bodies to have regard to biodiversity conservation when carrying out their functions. This is commonly referred to as the 'Biodiversity duty'.</i></b></p> <p>1.2 We agree that the methodology should separate any consideration of potential strategic site allocations from the settlement boundary criteria, and therefore that any development proposals are not relevant to the setting of the settlement boundaries.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		We have a number of detailed concerns where we consider that the settlement boundaries proposed do not accord with the criteria. These are set out on the attached table and accompanying map.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		We have several suggestions where we consider that the boundaries should be revised (shown in red) so that the boundary meets the criteria set (including the proposed biodiversity/landscape criterion). Please see attached table and map.	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		Bradford-on-Avon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>

the boundary relates:			your modification relate to:
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
	Location	Comment/ suggestion	Reasons
	A	Agree to change	This verge includes hedgerow and trees that have a strong relationship to the countryside beyond.
	B	<p>Disagree to inclusion of two dwellings as being within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Proposal: EXCLUDE these two dwellings from the settlement boundary as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>These two dwellings, one historic and one contemporary, sit within an isolated piece of land that is surrounded on all sides by open countryside. In public views from the road and from the nearby PROW they appear as houses in a rural setting. They are clearly outside the fabric of the town.</p>
	C	<p>Agree to the exclusion of orchards in open countryside, BUT do not agree with the proposed boundary as this excludes an adjacent area of Traditional Orchard NERC priority and an area of allotments that have a strong relationship to adjacent allotments that are excluded from the settlement boundary and to the countryside.</p> <p>Proposal: EXCLUDE the Traditional Orchard and adjacent allotments from the settlement boundary, as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>All other orchards and allotments on the boundary of Bradford on Avon are excluded from the settlement boundary and a consistent approach needs to be taken here.</p> <p>The Traditional Orchard forms an extension of the adjacent orchard already proposed for exclusion from the settlement boundary. This habitat is shown on Natural England's Magic Map and as protected from development through planning consent granted on appeal APP/Y3940/A/12/2188842.</p> <p>The allotments also include a veteran fruit tree and continuity of green space between the countryside and the orchards.</p> <p>The proposed change leaves two cottages within open countryside, but this is correct as they are separated from the built form of Woolley by allotments and orchards, and their gardens also provide continuity of habitat through the presence of mature and characteristic fruit trees.</p>
D	Agree	Includes the verge and associated vegetation that relate to open countryside.	

	E	Agree	This land is outside the historic boundary of the settlement at Woolley and visually relates strongly to the adjacent open countryside.
	F	Agree	These small fields/orchards are a characteristic feature of the locality and form a continuation of the rural landscape.
	G	Agree but with modification:  Proposal: EXTEND the settlement boundary to include the garages and hard standing – as shown on the attached plan.	The settlement boundary is right to include the bungalows, but it should INCLUDE the commercial part of this site – being a rank of garages formerly used as the base for milk floats.  The garages that formed part of the former milk delivery business form an integral part of the adjacent bungalow development which is included in the settlement boundary.
	H	Agree	This is a continuation of an open field.
	I	Disagree  Proposal: EXTEND the settlement boundary to follow a simple alignment around the whole of this housing development (and not cut in westwards) and then cross the Holt Road to join the proposed boundary around the Kingston Farm site. Please see the attached plan.	This land is bounded by a road and modern housing and a driveway and is not related either functionally or visually to the countryside.
	J	Agree	This is the open area adjacent to the Kingston Farm site that is subject to a proposed planning permission. It forms an integral part of the rural river valley landscape.
	K	Agree	This area comprises woodland that relates to and is continuation of the rural river valley landscape and defines the margin of the landscape setting to The Hall.
	L	Agree	This forms part of the river valley landscape.
	M&N	Partly Agree  Proposal: EXTEND the settlement boundary to run along its original line – along the garden boundaries (and not cut gardens in half). Please see attached plan.	The open landscape of the golf course forms part of the wider river valley landscape, which is defined along nearly all of its southern margin by a strong hedgerow and tree line. It is in line with the criteria that this landscape features is excluded from the settlement boundary.  However, on balance we do not consider that the residential gardens should not be included within the countryside as

		they visually and functionally relate to the settlement. In addition development would not 'extend the built form of the settlement into the countryside as the gardens are visually contained within the straight and continuous domestic garden boundaries.  We recommend that it is more defensible for the settlement boundary to follow distinct features in the landscape and not to divide gardens in half.
O	Agree	The open space alongside the canal and defining the edge of Southway Park is an open amenity area that is visually and functionally outside the settlement and therefore relates more as a continuation of the countryside.
P	Agree	This is an area of open and seemingly unused land that is fairly well treed.
Q	Disagree  Proposal: EXTEND the proposed settlement boundary to its original line – to run along Jones' Hill and exclude the domestic garden.	This land is bounded by a stone wall and housing and is a domestic garden. It does not functionally or visually relate to the countryside. It appears arbitrary to exclude this from the settlement boundary but include the adjacent house.
R X, Y	Agree  Proposal: EXCLUDE the river and bankside vegetation from the settlement boundary to the east and west of the town centre, as shown on the attached plan at X and Y.	The principle of excluding the canal and river and its bankside vegetation should be consistently applied in Bradford on Avon. Currently the boundary is proposed to be amended to exclude the canal and its bankside vegetation but not the river.  The river and its associated bankside vegetation should be outside the settlement boundary as it is a continuation of the landscape beyond.
S	Agree with modification.  Proposal: The large residential garden along the river bank in front of Kingston Lodge should be EXCLUDED from the settlement boundary	This open field, parkland and large garden forms an important and continuous part of the river valley landscape and should therefore be excluded from the settlement boundary. Development in this large garden would extend the built form of the settlement and should therefore be excluded.
T	Agree	The EXCLUSION of part of the landscaped grounds Belcombe Court was an anomaly, which the redrawing of the settlement boundary will rectify. We agree that the entire Belcombe Court landscape should be outside the settlement boundary.
U	Agree	We presume that this land forms part of the Belcombe Court Grounds and it is therefore correct to EXCLUDE it from the settlement boundary
V	Agree	The playing field to the west of the Music Centre forms a

			continuation of the amenity and rural landscape beyond.
	W	Agree	This area of land includes some hedgerow and trees that have a strong relationship to the countryside beyond.
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>We can confirm that the emerging Bradford on Avon Neighbourhood Plan will include a review of the settlement boundary and the anticipated timescale for this is by the end of 2014.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>We welcome Wiltshire Council's progress in reviewing the settlement boundaries.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3124628 (comments + map)</p>		

<b>Comment ID:</b>	215	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Bob Lunn <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Urchfont Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 398000	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 215	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	F5 - F6	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Extended to include whole yard.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	216	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Bob Lunn <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Urchfont Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 398000</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 216</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Increased to take in whole garden.		

<b>proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	217	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Bob Lunn <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Urchfont Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 398000</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 217</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>		Yes	

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J5 - J6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Small area now included.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	218	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Bob Lunn <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Urchfont Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 398000</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 218</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement</b>			

<b>boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Urchfont	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	18
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Two areas included, one has already been built on.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	219	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr and Mrs  A & M H  Shannon	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 219

		<b>Person ID:</b> 858984	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>I have seen the draft proposals which show our property in The Knowle, Stockley Lane, Calne SN11 0SE as being already within the settlement boundary. This is totally incorrect as properties in The Knowle are and have always been part of Calne Without Parish.</p> <p>I would ask that this error be amended accordingly. Furthermore, I see absolutely no reasons why this should be changed and emphatically request that our property remains part of the Calne Without Parish.</p>		

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	220	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Whitmore <b>Broad Chalke Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 391656	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 220
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>			

<p><b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft proposals for rationalising Settlement Boundaries. Representatives of Broad Chalke Parish Council attended your briefing in Salisbury on 29 July and we are aware of what is involved.</p> <p><b>The Rationale.</b> We understand the rationale being applied to settlement boundaries and can see that in general terms you are seeking to create space for low-impact infill development whilst minimising the impact on our surrounding environment (as identified in the Broad Chalke Conservation Area Management Plan<sup>1</sup>). There appear to be a number of small anomalies which we would like to discuss with the authors of the proposed changes through the medium of our Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan.</b> Broad Chalke is registered with Wilts Council as a neighbourhood planning area and our planning is already well advanced. An extensive consultation process<sup>2</sup> took place last year which led to the establishment of a <i>Community Hub</i><sup>3</sup> as a matter of some urgency last year - and we are now moving forward with proposals for <i>Affordable Housing</i> as our next priority.</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing.</b> The need for a plot of at least 6 new affordable houses in Broad Chalke is a long-standing aspiration. It was well supported in last year's consultation; it will form a key element of our Neighbourhood Plan; and it fits squarely within the framework of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, a further adjustment to our settlement boundaries is likely to be required to accommodate such a development. We will consult on this with the local community as part of our Neighbourhood Planning process and liaise closely with our designated point of contact in Wiltshire Council (Mrs Sarah Hughes), as we have done to date.</p> <p><b>Timescale.</b> The timescale for bringing our Neighbourhood Plan (and associated plans for affordable housing) to a conclusion tie in very neatly with your settlement boundaries timescale: We aim to finalise the drafting of the Broad Chalke Neighbourhood Plan this autumn (coincident with your Plan Preparation phase up to November 2014) and then consult on its recommendations including those for affordable housing in the spring (coincident with your Formal Consultation January - March 2015). Inasmuch that we have already consulted widely and that feedback from the community (including on affordable housing) was both consistent and positive, we do not anticipate any significant delay or disagreement in the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p><b>Conclusion.</b> In summary, we note your proposals for sensible rationalisation of Broad Chalke settlement boundaries and will work with you, through the medium of our Neighbourhood Plan and its consultation process, to iron out any anomalies and to identify a suitable plot of land for the development of affordable housing within the Parish boundary.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> 'Broad Chalke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan'. Salisbury District Council 2008.  <sup>2</sup>Consisting of an extensive Village Questionnaire and a series of village meetings – both very well supported.  <sup>3</sup> The Community Hub comprises the Chalke Valley Stores (which replaces our old village shop), Post Office (which was threatened with closure), Chapel and Benefice Office, Archives, Police Post and Cyber Café. It was awarded the Countryside Alliance prize for the 'Best Village Shop &amp; Post Office 2013'.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting</b></p>	<p>3124676 (comments)</p>

<b>documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	221	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Steve Colling <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 221
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Long gardens outside boundary but on west of H8 they are included - inconsistent		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016.		

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	222	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Amanda J Atkins <b>Britford Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 390337	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 222
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		We consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones because it seems sensible to include what has already been built and what has been allocated.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>			

proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	223	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Amanda J Atkins <b>Britford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390337	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 223
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?			
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?		It would appear to us that the criterion have been followed in drawing the draft settlement boundaries as we can see areas have been included for existing site allocations. In so far as the boundaries closest to Britford are concerned we are in agreement that they follow the criterion.	
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that			

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	224	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Amanda J Atkins <b>Britford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390337	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 224
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b>			

settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?			
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?			
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?	At the moment we have no plans to review our settlement boundaries in a neighbourhood plan.		
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	225	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Amanda J Atkins <b>Britford Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 390337	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 225
Question 1 - Do you consider			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>It seems to us that a boundary review is long overdue and that if it is to be a sustainable and long term review it needs to take into account past and future (allocated) development to ensure that settlement boundaries are a useful planning tool which are not continually undermined by permissions granted outside them.</p> <p>We agree that the extension to the boundary on the south of the A338 Downton Road is sensible as it includes existing development and unbuilt permissions.</p> <p>The Dairy and the Park and Ride provide a definitive boundary to the residential development as beyond them is open countryside and agricultural land.</p> <p>The boundary to the north of the A338 has remained unchanged and we agree that this complies with the criteria and we welcome the fact that this remains unchanged as it provided an important gap between the main settlement of Salisbury and the smaller settlement of Britford village.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b></p>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	226	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Joe Durrant <b>Person ID:</b> 859004	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 226
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Chippenham	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any</b>	Could you please explain why Chippenham has been excluded from the settlement boundary review and is "to be undertaken as part of the		

<b>additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Chippenham Site Allocations DPD."?	
		With regards to Chippenham I would like to highlight that Wiltshire Council has previously ruled out building on the outer side of the A350. I feel it would be detrimental to do so and would affect the integrity of the town which already suffers from a lack of amenities and infrastructure (particularly the one way system in the centre of the town). Chippenham has a natural boundary in the form of the A350 and I believe this should be maintained.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	227	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Phil  Jefferson <b>Chapmanslade Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 859006	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 227
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>	

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>Chapmanslade Parish Council considered these at its meeting earlier this month and wishes to make the following observations:-</p> <p>First, we do appreciate the need for a consistent countywide system of drawing up settlement boundaries.</p> <p>We do, however, have concerns about some of the criteria chosen for this purpose. Specifically, we are concerned about the inclusion of religious buildings, schools and community halls, and particularly site allocations for community and employment uses within the criteria. We believe that this could be detrimental to the best interests of communities as in the long term it could result in more housing development taking place than communities might feel was desirable. This might serve the purposes of developers but we believe it would not necessarily be in the best interests of our community.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	228	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms. Beccy Santhouse <b>Person ID:</b> 858947	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 228
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			

<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>In addition to the previous points about excluding our working office, I would like to add that: excluding our garden is incorrect, because it follows a logical line along the North wall to eventually meet part way up with the boundary of Everett Close. It is inconsistent to exclude it, especially given that the wood/garden which backs onto the industrial estate on its East side and to field on its North and West sides and does not back onto the houses by which it is used, is maintained within the village boundaries, even though it is on the same line as our garden which is being excluded. Also inconsistent is the new inclusion of garden which appears bigger than ours, into the village on the South East edge of the village. It does to have any logical link to other parts of the village structure</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	229	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr and Mrs  A & M H  Shannon  <b>Person ID:</b> 858984	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 229	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>				
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>				
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		I refer to the Calne Settlement Boundary Review Informal Consultation documents received. On examination of the plan for the Rookery Park area I note in particular The Plan shows The Knowle, in which my property is situated, as being within the existing settlement boundary, and shows it as also being		

		<p>within the proposed settlement boundary. The Knowle has never been within the settlement boundary, and myself and the other residents have no wish for this to change wishing that it remain within the Calne Without Parish.</p> <p>I note that the largest boundary revision in the area of the junction of The Rise in Rookery Park, and Stockley Lane, proposes that The Croft owned by Mr Paul Morrison,( who incidently has no knowledge of this proposal) has the house itself is shown as being within the settlement boundary, whilst his front drive, garden and access onto Stockley Lane, are now shown as within the Calne without parish along with what appears to be about 100m of Stockley Lane. Has this large area just been omitted from the Settlement as it appears that much of it may be on a flood plain?</p> <p>It is also noted that The Atwell Wilson Motor Museum has now been transferred to be within the Settlement Boundary but the new boundary seems that it follows no property boundary but cuts across their land following no particular feature or boundary. Is this done to discourage any possible future development of the museum.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	230	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Stephen  Colling  <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 230
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Burbage	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	H6
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	Not clear why the expansion is necessary		
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?	Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016		
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?	There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.		
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	231	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Colling <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 231
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?	The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.		
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are	Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)		

<b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	K8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Not clear why the expansion is necessary		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	232	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Colling <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 232
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Burbage</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>H8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Revert to original / existing - no reason for expansion</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	233	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Colling  <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 233	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H4	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Western Edge - revert to original boundary or redraw to include buildings but not long gardens/land. See - K9			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that			

		violate the boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	234	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Colling <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 234
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G3
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Second from top - revert to original/existing. No reason for change	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>		Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016	

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	235	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Stephen  Colling  <b>Person ID:</b> 857990	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 235
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		The criterion should be used for guidance - they should not be absolute and boundaries should be adjusted to meet local/historical criterion.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Generally, the boundaries are in accordance with the criterion but there are inconsistencies - some large curtilages are 'in' and some 'out'. This has caused us some angst! We have suggested changes to reflect an even handed approach based on local knowledge (see part c)	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		Burbage	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b> 11 i

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Extend boundary to include area granted outline planning 13/03498/OUT	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Burbage Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan which we hope to submit in 2016	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		There is little point in having a review if developers can submit a planning application to build on the edge of the settlement boundary and have it approved by Wiltshire council. Once approved, the boundary should remain unchanged until the next review and the council must reject planning applications that violate the boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	236	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Drena Frankham <b>Person ID:</b> 476783	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 236
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are</b>			

<p><b>drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Calne</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>2 The Knowle, Stockley Lane, Calne, SN11 0se</p> <p>I am a resident at the above address within the parish of Calne Without. It has come to my attention that Wiltshire Council is proposing a revision to the settlement boundary of the The Knowle and The Willows. Your proposal shows that The Knowle and The Willows are already within the Calne Settlement Boundary. This is incorrect. I have lived in The Knowle since December 1995 and we have always been outside the Calne Settlement Boundary. The Knowle is surrounded on 3 sides by open fields. Indeed part of our property is a large garden meadow which is outside the incorrect existing boundary, and outside the proposal revision. The correct existing boundary is the southern boundary of 42 Stockley Lane running approximately NW to SE.</p> <p>Please note that I wish most strongly that our property remains rural and remains within the parish of Calne Without.</p> <p>Our local Calne Without councillor, Kate Morley, has been informed and this email has been copied to her.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	237	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Ian Frankham  <b>Person ID:</b> 859034	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 237	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>				
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Calne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>		
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>				
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		2 The Knowle, Stockley Lane, Calne, SN11 0se I am a resident at the above address within the parish of Calne Without. It has come to my attention that Wiltshire Council is proposing a		

		<p>revision to the settlement boundary of the The Knowle and The Willows. Your proposal shows that The Knowle and The Willows are already within the Calne Settlement Boundary. This is incorrect. I have lived in The Knowle since December 1995 and we have always been outside the Calne Settlement Boundary. The Knowle is surrounded on 3 sides by open fields. Indeed part of our property is a large garden meadow which is outside the incorrect existing boundary, and outside the proposal revision. The correct existing boundary is the southern boundary of 42 Stockley Lane running approximately NW to SE.</p> <p>Please note that I wish most strongly that our property remains rural and remains within the parish of Calne Without.</p> <p>Our local Calne Without councillor, Kate Morley, has been informed and this email has been copied to her.</p>	
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>238</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Anderson <b>Person ID:</b> 859037</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 238</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b></p>		<p>Codford</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b></p>

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>I am writing in regards to the Codford settlement boundary and proposed alterations. I am the owner of the barn and old dairy behind 124 High Street , Codford and I was delighted that an opportunity to include the West section of Codford is now being considered within the settlement boundary. As your records will indicate I had previously applied for planning permission and it was rejected due to my land not falling within the settlement boundary, regardless to full parish council support and no local objection from residents. Conversely, approximately twenty letters from the local community were written to West DC planning department to support development of the barn. Consequently, I am sure it will come as no surprise that I would fully support the alteration to the settlement boundary.</p> <p>My comments above clearly highlight a personal interest into the change, however, I think it is also important to point out that the current boundary does not include Codford village as an entirety. Thus, this does not encompass properties with a historical link to Codford such as the original Codford School House and my property which was previously a coal yard and then became a dairy. My point is that it always had a function within the village but currently it is derelict and falling into disrepair. Developing a property on the site would provide an opportunity to not only tidy the area up in a manner sympathetic to the village identity. It would also enable me to be better located to my property to maintain the surrounding land and outbuildings to a standard that will improve the image of the West entry to Codford. If I have one concern it is that the proposed change to the settle boundary would appear to be drawn rather tightly around the existing barn limiting the potential for amenity space in the form of a garden .</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and I look forward to hearing the conclusion on this proposal.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	239	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Emma Tyler	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 239

		Kington St Michael Parish Council <b>Person ID:</b> 859041	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Kington St Michael	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>Kington St Michael Parish Council considered the proposed settlement boundaries during a meeting held on 18th September 2014.</p> <p>With the exception of the amendment outlined in the paragraph below, the council did not object to the proposed settlement boundaries as such, but (as per my e-mail dated 15/09/14) did query the proposed reduction in size, when we had been told that we might have to identify sites for the provision of further housing. Please could you confirm that this is no longer the case?</p>		

		The Parish Council fully support the requested amendment to the proposed boundary e-mailed to you by Frank Hughes and Jehanne Le Quesne (copied below), and would ask that you adjust the boundary to include the northern section of their garden at 'Greenlands' (formerly 'Glenroy'), Stanton Lane, Kington St Michael, SN14 6JQ.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	240	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Andy Havard Fovant Parish Council <b>Person ID:</b> 859044	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 240
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Fovant	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The draft Housing Policy Boundary (HPB) proposed for Fovant has been reviewed and Fovant Parish Council (FPC) have the following observations.  FPC consider that the draft HPB is incorrect.  FPC understands that the Core Strategy requires that HPBs are to be retained for Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages (formerly referred to as Secondary Villages in the South Wiltshire Core Strategy), but are to be removed for other settlements.  It was accepted at the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination in Public in 2010, and at a subsequent meeting with Mr Milton, that Fovant failed to meet the criteria for a Secondary Village.  It is noted that Fovant's failure to meet these criteria has not been temporary, it is still the case some 4 years later.  Accordingly, FPC consider that the HPB for Fovant should be removed, consistent with all the other settlements which also fail to meet the criteria for Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>241</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b>  Mr  Peter  Baxter  <b>Clerk</b>    <b>Worton Parish Council</b>    <b>Person ID:</b> 785423</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>    <b>Person ID:</b> 241</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes. We have nothing further to add.</p>		

<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>On the whole, the criteria have been applied consistently with the following exceptions that need review. References relate to the grid co-ordinates given on the CC's consultation for Worton. See attached map.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>See following reps.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>At this stage, no. WPC will contribute to the consultation on the proposed Wiltshire Housing Site Development Plan Document and await the publication of the DPD during 2015 before making its decision on the requirement for a Worton neighbourhood plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Nothing further to add.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>242</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Worton Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 242</b></p>

		Person ID: 785423	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Worton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The boundary to the north of the three houses at the west of the grid square should be brought closer to the houses to be consistent with the boundary to houses on either side.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	243	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Worton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 785423</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 243</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Worton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	16
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The buildings and associated land used for the local coach business to the north of the boundary line should be regarded as functionally & physically related to the village and should be included within the boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	244	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Worton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 785423</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 244</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Worton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I6

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		The proposed new boundary line cuts back to the High Street to exclude two small fields. These fields are not part of the open countryside. The boundary should be re-drawn to include these fields.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	245	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  Peter  Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Worton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 785423</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 245</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>			

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Worton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> J5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Boundary to north of the houses at far east of grid square should be brought closer to the houses in order to be more consistent with the boundaries to the houses on either side.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	246	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Peter Baxter <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Worton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 785423</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 246</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Worton	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	J6
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	The boundary around the finger of land running south should be brought back towards the house on the south side of the High Street, consistent with the boundaries to properties on either side.		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	247	<b>Consultee:</b> B  Wells  <b>Person ID:</b> 836022	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 247
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>No.</p> <p>1. The proposed criterion does not even accord with the 233 Consultees who submitted 342 comments between them during the original boundary consultation 'Wiltshire Housing Sites DPD Reg 18 held 20th March-6th June 2014. Only 5 of the current consultees took part in the last DPD consultation, so are the rest of the 'new' consultees aware of existence of the first DPD Reg 18 consultation held in March 2014? The 2 consultations do not appear to be linked on the portal, to enable consultees to cross reference how the criterion was developed.</p> <p>2. Having read through all of the comments from both DPD consultations, the 1st consultation was held in order to establish the parameters of this current consultation. I understand that it was proposed that the DPD Review would have two key purposes, namely (i) to identify housing sites to achieve the delivery of housing growth set out within the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy, and (ii) to review settlement boundaries in various settlements including 'Large Villages' in line with emerging strategy, in order to meet NPPF Paras 14 &amp; 47 and the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy 2026 Strategic Objective 3.</p> <p>3. However, the current criterion fails to incorporate the views of the 233 Consultees who originally were consulted, and in some cases clearly ignored repeated expectations of this consultation. Therefore the selected criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries is not the correct ones to be used.</p> <p>4. The proposed criterion will not enable Wiltshire Council to meet the expectation of Senior Housing and Planning Inspector Seaman's requirements as detailed in EXAM 10th Procedural Letter: 'With paragraph 47 in mind, the Council will be aware that the Framework requires a Local Plan to be aspirational but realistic. Against this context, the setting of a housing requirement which is undeliverable may compromise the ability of the Plan to effectively deliver sustainable forms of development supported by adequate infrastructure.'.....'The Framework calls for a significant boost to housing supply.'</p> <p>5. If these draft boundary criterion are proposed to be the strict framework on which to identify 'realistically deliverable' land supply sites in order to meet identified housing need requirements from 2014-2019, it will not be 'achievable' as the proposed boundaries will restrict/stifle the possibility of identifying additional housing sites still further.</p> <p>6. If the original out-dated boundaries were adequate in their current form, then it would have been able to meet and provide the significant boost to the housing supply without the need for a Settlement Boundary review. Presumably, if this were the case, it would not have prompted the Inspector to tactfully 'guide' Wiltshire Council to look again at the out-dated boundaries.</p>	

7. This proposed criterion does not change the out-dated boundary significantly enough, and will not provide a substantial amount of Suitable, Available, Achievable and therefore 'Deliverable' land to meet the minimum housing requirement of 42,000.
8. Every garden is being reduced and amenity land protected within the proposed settlement boundary...are you proposing that no small scale housing is ever allowed to be built within the settlement boundary and that only large developments identified by Wiltshire Council SHLAA's and Large scale developers can only ever be built in Wiltshire? Is this what you are actually proposing? Because this is what it looks like and it will drastically affect the ability for any development to be built for the next 20 years.
9. The scale of the deficit is such that it means that in order for sustainable settlements to accommodate the additional housing required has to occur outside the current out-dated boundaries, NOT inside, which is what Wiltshire Council is now proposing. These current boundary proposals only appear to 'tidy up' the old boundaries by applying this new criterion directly onto the out-dated boundaries in order to make them comply and make them tighter to constrict growth.
10. The proposed criterion does not address the Inspector's assertion that out-dated settlement boundaries throughout the community area, which are not able to support sustainable forms of development that exceed the minimally required housing requirement from 2014-2026, will result in a Local Plan that is undeliverable. This assertion is very clear and to fail in this duty to identify sustainable, deliverable sites will result in the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2026 failing at this critical stage in the examination process.
11. Garden grabbing has already been removed from the NPPF; no one is meant to be building in their back gardens any more, however residents still have their 'permitted development rights' and so the proposed boundaries should respect this – moving the boundary right up to the back door is not acceptable and potentially illegal as it removes householders 'permitted development rights' which have been respected and extended within the NPPF and PPG.
12. However, in theory (but not under this new legislation) large gardens could be built in but only if the household identifies a genuine housing need for an emerging young adult or elderly parent -then affordable housing will be the motivation of the home owning baby-boomers as they try to keep build costs down for themselves or their kin. Covenants could be placed on these buildings to ensure that they are kept affordable in perpetuity just as policy is trying to keep 'exception sites' 100% affordable in perpetuity (without success as exception sites are very rare). This is how houses were built historically, a housing need was identified within the family and if you were lucky to have a spare bit of garden or land...you built in it. This is how Britain has been built for centuries.
13. Individual householders are the single biggest house-builder across the country. It is actually individual householders that are the greatest collective developer throughout the decades NOT the big house-builders which build only on large identified sites, so by employing a garden restriction you will be stopping the country's biggest collective developer from building on their garden land, so there will be nowhere left to build at all. Unless you are a large scale developer that has money to throw at councils to release green field sites. We want natural sustainable spread out growth that is gently integrated into the existing settlements.
14. However, I have noticed in the Land Supply Statement July 2014, that Wiltshire Council are still granted permissions to development in gardens, especially if this contravention goes un-noticed by consultees: w/11/01637 and w/13/00971 both are in Heytesbury and w/12/01490 in Sutton Veny. Why is this?

<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>No.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following a review of all of the maps, they are consistently inconsistent with your own proposed criterion.</li> <li>2. The original boundary should be removed altogether but any land/building ownership boundaries that were originally inside the out-dated boundary should not be reduced in any way shape or form. Wiltshire Council will be setting up a storm of legal challenges from householders and landowners who feel rightly discriminated against because they happen to live on the edge of the settlement boundary. Local taxpayers cannot afford to pay the court costs if judgements are found against Wiltshire Council as a result of this boundary review.</li> <li>3. All residents who have had their historical boundary reduced should be informed via letter of the proposals, as this consultation has not been widely advertised. My parish council gave just 1 week for residents to provide comments direct to the parish administrator, who is infamously not as efficient as one would hope at the best of times. This is despite the fact that this consultation has had 8 weeks to run and parish councils were invited to attend information days in July 2014.</li> <li>4. The proposed boundary does not consider the additional allocation that will be attributed to Large Village settlements in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy 2026.</li> <li>5. Only 49 indicative requirements have been allocated to Warminster Community Area (CA), but No Large Site strategic land allocations have been identified to meet this 'indicative requirement' – a heavy dependence on small windfall sites coming forward over the plan period is relied upon, but given the constrained proposed settlement boundaries these will not be able to be found. Indeed, 4 out of the 7 sites identified in the Warminster CA SHLAA have been excluded from this proposed boundary review and remain outside the old and proposed boundary (see Point 7 below).</li> <li>6. However, analysis of the Housing Land Supply Statement July 2014 demonstrates that the 24 Development Commitments detailed in Appendix 6 – Summary Assessment of Supply and Remaining Housing to be Identified (by Community Area), is incorrect. The actual figure should be 18 before applying Method 1 to account for actual anticipated delivery rates. If you then apply Method 1 this figure drops further to 14. Please read the evidence I have provided to demonstrate how I have calculated these figures based on the publically available reports Wiltshire Council has published.  (Summary attached: Mr B Wells 5 Year Land Supply Allocation Compared with Identified Housing Need)</li> <li>7. Warminster CA SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) identifies 109 'constrained' units identified with a potential 'Deliverability', and presented as 'evidence of future potential land supply' to the examination:  All 7 Sites are theoretically 'deliverable within 5 years' however:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NONE have planning permissions</li> <li>• NONE have been allocated in Housing Land Supply Jul14</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
--	--

- All contain AONB / Landscape Constraints
- 3 sites lie outside old boundary = 70 units / 3.67h
- 2 sites lie inside new proposed boundary July '14= 15 units / 0.77h
- 1 site is perversely inside the old boundary but outside the proposed boundary= 8 units /0.42h
- 1 site is located in a small village so only limited in-fill is allowed = 6 units / 0.29h
- So a total of 7 Sites with a potential of delivering 109 units covering 5.15h (15 acres) of identified constrained land, with only 2 of these sites (15 units / 0.77h) repositioned within the proposed boundary.
- All of these sites have been identified following the 'Call for Sites' exercise(?) and have presumably been put forward by the owners, but this boundary review has actively excluded them from the proposed boundaries, yet their information has been put in the SHLAA and provided to the Inspector as 'evidence' of a potential source of future land supply. Why is this?

These sites have been assessed and understandably need to go through the planning process first to ensure they are robust, but SHLAA sites need to be incorporated into the proposed boundary to enable communities to scrutinise them throughout this Settlement Boundary Review process. It could also undermine other landowners putting forward their sites if their information is going to be utilised as convenient 'evidence' but with no real prospect of the sustainable sites being developed.

Equally, residents will be very wary if suddenly additional sites are pulled out of the SHLAA hat which were not considered during this review as the sites had not been shown on these proposed boundary maps.

8. In addition, the inflated '49' indicative requirement is not enough compared with the identified Warminster Community Area Housing Need. Housing Needs Surveys have been completed over the past 18 months yet no collective information about their results have been published in order to compare them with the Land Supply data.

Interestingly, only the small villages have completed surveys over the past 18 months despite only being 'allowed' limited in-fill over the plan period. The large villages have only just started their surveys even though they were allocated as areas to locate additional housing over the plan period. Why are the survey resources targeting small villages first before establishing the need of the larger villages first? And why has the collective 'running total' of identified housing need not been published in the eWCS 2026. have collated all 61 surveys and have this information...if you haven't already produced it?

#### 9. WILTSHIRE HOUSING NEEDS SURVEYS OVERVIEW:

- 61 Villages have completed housing surveys out of a possible 173 Villages
- Warminster Community Area: Identified Housing Need via these surveys have established:

8 Small Villages currently need 46 extra affordable + intermediate dwellings  
(Chitterne, Longbridge Deverill, Crockerton, Horningsham, Brixton and Kingston Deverill, Maiden Bradley, Yarnfield)

5 Large Villages currently need an estimated 60 affordable + intermediate dwellings  
(None of the large villages have conducted their surveys to date: Chapmanslade, Codford, Corsley, Heytesbury, Sutton Veny)

	<p>WARMINSTER CA TOTAL HOUSING NEED= 46 + 60 est. = 106 UNITS</p> <p>Survey authors reiterate throughout the surveys that the identified housing need data in the contained in the surveys represent a 'quarter' of evidence needed to fully assess the actual housing need. So 106 units only represents a 'conservative ' third of the total housing need, as it excludes households on the Wiltshire Housing Register. Therefore applying an estimated hypotheses projection to the survey housing need data equates to:</p> <p>106x3 = 318 Affordable/ Intermediate Units Required 2014-2026</p> <p>10. Based on an analysis of Wiltshire's 61 Housing Needs Surveys demonstrates that there is an identified housing need minimum total of 318 Affordable + Intermediate dwelling units in the Warminster Community Area alone.</p> <p>(I can provide a complete detailed analysis if you require – an Overview Summary has been attached: Mr B Wells 5 Year Land Supply Allocation Compared with Identified Housing Need) Q.3 Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</p> <p>11. In conclusion, when comparing all the data which is publically available for Warminster Community Area, there is an extreme deficit in the full, objectively assessed housing need requirement of 318 units compared with the 49 'indicative requirement' for the Warminster CA. Therefore, the proposed boundary review will not significantly boost the housing land supply in order to meet this identified need and meet NPPF Para's 14+47 along with eWCS 2026 Strategic Objective 3. This only represents a detailed analysis of 1 community area within Wiltshire. Has a detailed analysis of all the Housing Needs Survey results ever been conducted?....and then published? As I have not been able to find this.</p> <p>12. If a collective analysis of Wiltshire Housing Needs Surveys also identifies extreme deficits in 'identified housing need' compared with the land supply evidence, this could result in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy 2026 failing at this Examination stage.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Warminster</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Warminster Community Area Village maps - all of them</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>1. I would like to see the 'number of hectares' that the proposed boundaries will be providing for 'each settlement area', detailed on each proposed map. It would be useful to compare this with the out-dated boundary hectare amount, as the boundary review is meant to</p>		

	<p>significantly boost the supply of housing. Measuring the 'Settlement Boundary Hectares' would be a useful comparison tool and allow transparency for residents and put things into a visual perspective. i.e How much land is actually 'built' on</p> <p>2. I would like to see each settlement's Conservation Area boundary shown on each proposed boundary map as well. Conservation Areas are a planning instrument which also restricts planning. Some Conservation Areas are grossly bloated and disproportionate compared with the Settlement Boundary e.g Sutton Veny.</p> <p>3. Many Conservation Area boundaries have never been adopted or even publically consulted on, many were roughly drawn up in the 1970's and have never been reviewed since, which is unacceptable. There are only 10 Wiltshire Conservation Areas that have been democratically reviewed, consulted on and formerly adopted...out of 173 villages.</p> <p>4. The 2 Settlement Boundary consultations do not appear to be linked on the portal, to enable consultees to cross reference how the criterion was developed. I would like to see the current and future consultations linked on the portal.</p>
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>1. My village parish council isn't bothering with a neighbourhood plan, they plan to sit tight, do nothing and hope that the world passes them by without noticing they are there...and housing can be dumped in the next village down the road, they laugh during their meetings. As a result of this inertia, the Inspector is right to push for a review of boundaries now rather than waiting for Neighbourhood Plans to emerge as this will take years, whether deliberately or not we will never truly know.</p> <p>2. Whilst Neighbourhood Plans are a good idea on paper, the reality is that parish councils are the ones expected to steer these plans. Parish Council's are not best placed to do this as they rely on self-motivated councillors who are largely self-elected by one another in order to guard one's self interests unfortunately. Neighbourhood Plans would be better organised by steering groups with 2 members allocated per interest group to ensure that dominance is minimised and all views are presented. Public displays, question-time scrutiny panels and opportunity for inclusive consultation should be implemented in order to provide evidence for everyone to scrutinise regularly. This takes time though.</p> <p>3. Fortunately Wiltshire Council has allocated my village as a Large Village, so please ensure that housing is evenly allocated throughout the Warminster Community Area to truly provide a sustainable pattern of development...based on the identified housing need. The current Settlement Boundaries were only introduced from 1994 onwards without any public consultation and were then incorporated into the 2004 LDP. An analysis of Wiltshire Census data shows stagnation in the number of housing that was built across Wiltshire, which is potentially due to restrictive development boundaries which have helped to create this housing crisis just 20 years later.</p> <p>4. The best approach would be to remove all boundaries and then scrutinise each planning application on a site-by-site basis to ensure that it is Suitable, Available, Achievable, Deliverable and Sustainable. This would motivate and encourage every town or village to organise a Neighbourhood Plan and prevent negligent inertia.</p>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>1. The people who are ultimately affected by this continued delay in the CS being adopted -supported by the reluctance of the baby-boom, 2nd home-owning, landlord-sitting, nimby Parish Council parishioners who have a strangle-hold on natural sustainable development; are those people, families and children who cannot find or afford their own sustainable home to live in. A generation of 20-40 yr old tenants</p>

	<p>'housed' by a generation of baby-boom landlords, who do not have the luxury of any garden, let alone a large garden to worry if the proposed boundary is right up against the kitchen window.</p> <p>2. 'Large garden boundaries disappearing' appears to be the overwhelming concern of the majority of Consultee comments so far, and, worryingly, the true focus of why we need the extra housing requirement is sadly lacking in the Consultee responses to date. As a baby-boomer myself, who has benefitted throughout the decades by squashing the generations behind us, I am ashamed to witness this one-sided 'parish council' orientated consultation.</p> <p>3. This consultation has to be opened up to everyone and greater effort has to be made in engaging families who need affordable housing, along with families who are caught in the 'renting trap' who are not enough in poverty to meet the strict 'in housing need' requirement but who are on an average wage which still cannot meet/afford the baby-boom expectation of oversized housing that baby-boomers are squatting in which now exceeds £250k when they eventually sell up.</p> <p>The average family on a wage of £50k (with 2 people in full time employment at £25k each which is over the current average Wiltshire wage of £22k) can still only achieve a mortgage of £180k. This is still the same as when we were younger but market family housing was in this achievable price bracket of the £150-180k. Something has to give...and it has to be a tiny bit of Wiltshire sustainable land or we have to downgrade the price of our inflated oversized homes, because we won't be able to build in our back garden any more...</p> <p>4. We never had boundaries before the 1970's, walk along any street and look up at the building line, you'll be able to tell the history of every home and the time it was built in just by the design...we won't have that timeline if we just dump 'large sites of monotonous buildings' in a field. Natural sustainable dwellings are spread throughout a settlement like a patchwork, absorbing the housing need as it arises whilst developing an ecosystem of sustainable, multigenerational communities.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3126750 (supporting evidence on housing land supply)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>248</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Lindsey Wood <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Kilmington Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 468232</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 248</p>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>At a meeting of the Parish Council held last week, I can confirm that the Parish Council has requested that Settlement Boundaries are reinstated for small villages, such as Kilmington, so that the parish has the opportunity for some small scale or infill development within the lifespan of the Core Strategy. In accordance with the views strongly expressed by representatives of the smaller villages and the larger villages and market towns at the briefing session attended in Salisbury, the parish council feels that it may like an opportunity for some housing in the next 12 years, especially for our young families and local people. Without a HSB this prospect is denied. There are present employment sites within the village which should be given the opportunity to grow and prosper and there are facilities within the village which need to be supported. To deny the village any form of future growth would be detrimental and damaging to the vitality of the village. Furthermore, by reinstating the opportunities for small villages to allow small amounts of growth you will lessen the burden placed on larger villages which may struggle to find available land for the housing expectations.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b></p>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	249	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Lindsey Wood <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>West Knoyle Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 392667</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 249</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		At a meeting of the Parish Council held last week, I can confirm that the Parish Council has requested that Settlement Boundaries are reinstated for small villages, such as West Knoyle, so that the parish has the opportunity for some small scale or infill development within the lifespan of the Core Strategy. In accordance with the views strongly expressed by representatives of the smaller villages and the larger villages and market towns at the briefing session attended in Salisbury, the parish council feels that it may like an opportunity for some housing in the next 12 years, especially for our young families and local people. Without a HSB this prospect is denied. There are present employment sites within the village which should be given the opportunity to grow and prosper and there are facilities within the village which need to be supported. To deny the village any form of future growth would be detrimental and damaging to the vitality of the village. Furthermore, by reinstating the opportunities for small villages to allow small amounts of growth you will lessen the burden placed on larger villages which may struggle to find available land for the housing expectations.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	250	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Alison McGowan <b>Clerk</b> <b>Alderbury Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 848894	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 250
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Alderbury Parish Council are happy to accept the revised boundaries shown on the map, except they would like Mr. Richard Wharton's comments to be taken into account as referred to in section C.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>			

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Alderbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Please see letter for Mr. Richard Wharton (Comment ID 114), a resident regarding his thoughts on the proposed boundary change that relates to his garden shown in the centre of the grid reference.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3126696 (Comments + letter from Mr R Wharton)		
<b>Comment ID:</b>	251	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 251
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b>			

that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?			
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?		Yes	
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:	Upavon	Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	F6
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	Boxed Area of Fariers Fariers Field on the side of the A342. We accept		
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers	3126735		
Comment ID:	252	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 252
Question 1 - Do you consider			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Upavon	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	E6.50F5
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	In view of current applications, should the area between Chicken Farm and Cemetery be involved??		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	3156077		

<b>Comment ID:</b>	253	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan  <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 253
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Upavon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Do not alter current boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	254	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 254
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Upavon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H504
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Maintain current boundary.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	255	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  G. Paul  Cowan  <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 255
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?			
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?			
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?		Yes	
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:	Upavon	Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	H5
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	West Boundary Accept Proposal.		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	256	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr  G. Paul  Cowan  <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 256
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Upavon	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	H6
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?		Accept all three changes.	
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	257	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 257
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?			
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?			

<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Upavon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> G6
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Accept change.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	258	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 258
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Upavon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Accept change		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	259	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 259

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Upavon	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	H8 & H9
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	In view of the fact that this school is mothballed by W/C this should be included in the future boundary.		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	260	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr G. Paul Cowan <b>Person ID:</b> 859308	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 260	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Upavon	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J.8	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Accept Modification		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>				

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	261	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Sandra Harry <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Tisbury Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391632	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 261
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at</b>	Yes – at least 12 months hence.		

<p><b>reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Yes – see below P.Cnllrs, having studied the draft revised settlement boundary in the consultation document, felt that the selection criteria used had led to the potential for larger scale developments in those settlements with better facilities, rather than a distribution amongst the area as a whole leading to smaller well integrated plots.</p> <p>Also, there appears to be inconsistencies in the application of the criteria used to amend the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>The following factors were considered to be crucial in any change to the current settlement boundary in Tisbury and should be reflected in the criteria used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Utility and transport infrastructure – in the case of Tisbury for example, increased demand on services and infrastructure that is already stretched would require significant capital expenditure to ensure minimum negative impact on current residents.</li> <li>b. Resistance to change on currently allocated employment sites.</li> <li>c. Developments on the edges of a village, leading to ‘bolt-on’ housing with little integration into the existing community.</li> <li>d. Smaller villages should not be excluded from infill development; one or two houses in each village has less impact on all communities than a larger ‘bolt-on’ development on the edge of a more significant community.</li> <li>e. P.Cnllrs raised 1 query in particular – the inclusion of the King George V th playing field; this is a charitable asset and as such cannot be used for development under the stated objectives.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3126863 (comments)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>262</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 262</p>

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Winterslow	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	N5-N6
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	N.E. Side of Tytherley Road		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	263	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 263	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>				
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>				
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	06-07	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	NE side of Typherley road (Developed Area).			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>				
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>				

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	264	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 264
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	N6-06
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	SE Side of Tytherley Road (Developed Area).		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>			

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	265	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 265
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	N6-N5

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		SE Side of Tytherley Road	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	266	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 266
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>		Yes	

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H3-H4-I4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	SE side of Middleton Road		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	267	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 267
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			

<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	NE side of Highfield Crescent (Running NW-SE)		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	268	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 268

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Between Highfield Crescent & Brown's Copse		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	269	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 269
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H3
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Triangular Plot east of Woodland Drive under development		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	270	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 270
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	C7
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Omit inclusion of bacildrove running NW-SE. Boundary to S.W. frontage of development.		

<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	271	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 271
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Winterslow	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	C7-C6
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	Omit inclusion of all Farm Budge but include Dufulling & Barn Attached.		
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers	3128502		
Comment ID:	272	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Shelley Parker <b>Town Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Marlborough Town Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 820230</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 272</p>
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?	<p>Councillors discussed this at their Planning meeting of 22nd September.</p> <p>Comments are:</p> <p>RESOLVED: unanimously that the following comments be submitted as the Town Council's response to the consultation:</p> <p>i. It was encouraging that the boundary line had been reduced and that the Town Council welcomed this revised boundary</p>		

	<p>ii. Lack of connection with the 2012 SHLAA sites and other more recently submitted sites made it difficult to put forward a properly informed response</p> <p>iii. That early consultation with town and parish councils ahead of the wider public consultation was welcome.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	273	<b>Consultee:</b> Jim & Sandra  George  <b>Person ID:</b> 861780	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 273
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Warminster	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		I would like to provide feedback on the proposed settlement boundary changes for Warminster as follows.  Draft proposal 1: reinstate the buffer zone in the WUE. We support this proposal. At some point between the original and current settlement boundary proposal a significant swathe of land acting as a buffer between the A36 and the proposed 900 houses to the north of Swaledale Road has been lost. We would add "by pulling back the settlement boundary to	

the beginning of the buffer zone". This land is needed for environmental, noise reduction, natural beauty and other reasons.

Draft proposal 2: Attempt to limit the number of homes in the WUE to the 900 originally proposed. We support this proposal. Whilst residents accept that Warminster may have to take the allotted number of dwellings proposed in the draft core strategy, we feel strongly that the allocation should be more fairly shared between east and west Warminster. This is not a case of 'not in my back yard' as we accept that the west must take its fair share of dwellings, but we believe it should be fair. If one ward or another takes more than its fair share of the allocation, as is likely if this proposal is not accepted, traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues will become extreme.

Draft proposal 3: Approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary as originally intended. We support this proposal.  
We further ask that Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.

Draft proposal 4: Move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for leisure. We support this proposal.  
Access to an industrial estate should not be via a residential estate as it would be. The area to the east of Bath Road is far better suited to access for companies. Additionally, we would urge the council to consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites in to the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.

Draft proposal 5: include the Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 within the settlement boundary but allocation as employment land only. We DO NOT support this proposal.  
Whilst we accept that Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained as employment land only.

Draft proposal 6: Approve Smallbrook Meadows, St George's playing fields and YeatesMeadow as being outside the settlement boundary. We support this proposal.

Draft proposal 7: Request Tynings Allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary, and made into statutory allotments. We support this proposal

Draft proposal 8: include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary. It is within the parish boundary and planning permission has been given for this development. We support this proposal.  
This is a perfect example of a fair allocation of the allotted homes in the draft core strategy. The potential for 317 homes to be built in this SHLAA would allow proposal 2 to be accepted.

Draft proposal 9: Include SHLAA sites 603, 2073, 2074 and 2075 on the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development. We support this proposal.

**Supporting documents - If you have any supporting**

<b>documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	274	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms. Sandra George <b>Person ID:</b> 861790	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 274
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			

**Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?**

I have the following comments to make on the above:-

Draft proposal 1: reinstate the original buffer zone in the WUE. We support this proposal.

At some point between the original and current settlement boundary proposal a significant swathe of land acting as a buffer between the A36 and the proposed 900 houses to the north of Swaledale Road has been lost. We would add "by pulling back the settlement boundary to the beginning of the buffer zone". This land is needed for environmental, noise reduction, natural beauty and other reasons.

Draft proposal 2: Attempt to limit the number of homes in the WUE to the 900 originally proposed. We support this proposal.

Whilst residents accept that Warminster may have to take the allotted number of dwellings proposed in the draft core strategy, we feel strongly that the allocation should be more fairly shared between east and west Warminster. This is not a case of 'not in my back yard' as we accept that the west must take its fair share of dwellings, but we believe it should be fair. If one ward or another takes more than its fair share of the allocation, as is likely if this proposal is not accepted, traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues will become extreme.

Draft proposal 3: Approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary as originally intended. We support this proposal.

We further ask that Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.

Draft proposal 4: Move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for leisure. We support this proposal.

Access to an industrial estate should not be via a residential estate as it would be. The area to the east of Bath Road is far better suited to access for companies. Additionally, we would urge the council to consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites in to the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.

Draft proposal 5: include the Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 within the settlement boundary but allocation as employment land only. We DO NOT support this proposal.

Whilst we accept that Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained as employment land only.

Draft proposal 6: Approve Smallbrook Meadows, St George's playing fields and Yeates Meadow as being outside the settlement boundary. We support this proposal.

Draft proposal 7: Request Tynings Allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary, and made into statutory allotments. We support this proposal

Draft proposal 8: include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary. It is within the parish boundary and planning

		<p>permission has been given for this development. We support this proposal. This is a perfect example of a fair allocation of the allotted homes in the draft core strategy. The potential for 317 homes to be built in this SHLAA would allow proposal 2 to be accepted.</p> <p>Draft proposal 9: Include SHLAA sites 603, 2073, 2074 and 2075 on the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development. We support this proposal.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	275	<b>Consultee:</b> Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol  <b>Person ID:</b> 861798	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 275
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Warminster	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Draft Proposal 1: reinstate the buffer zone in the WUE.</p> <p>We support this proposal, however, at some point between the original and current settlement boundary proposal, a significant swathe of land acting as a buffer between the A36 and the proposed 900 houses to the north of Swaledale Road has been lost. We would like the following to be added ' by pulling back the settlement boundary to the beginning of the buffer zone' as this land is needed for environmental reasons, noise reduction etc.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 2: attempt to limit the number of homes in the WUE to the 900 originally proposed.</p> <p>We support this proposal. Whilst we residents accept that Warminster may have to take the allotted number of dwellings as proposed in the Draft Core Strategy, we feel very strongly that the allocation should be much more fairly shared between the east and west of Warminster. This is not a case of 'NIMBY' as we accept that the west must take an equal share of the dwellings, but we believe it must be fair. If one ward or another has to take more than its fair share of the allocation, as is likely if this proposal is not accepted, traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues will become extreme and detrimental to Warminster as a whole.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 3: approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary as originally intended.</p> <p>We support this proposal and further ask that Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 4: move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for leisure.</p> <p>We support this proposal. We consider that access to an industrial estate should be not via a residential estate. The area to the east of Bath Road is better suited to access for commercial traffic. Additionally, we would urge the council to consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites into the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both the west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 5: include the Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 within the settlement boundary but allocation as employment land only.</p> <p>We DO NOT support this proposal. Whilst we accept that Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained purely as employment land.</p>

	<p>Draft Proposal 6: approve Smallbrook Meadows, St Georges playing fields and Yeats Meadow as being outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>We support this proposal.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 7: request Tynings allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary and made into statutory allotments.</p> <p>We support this proposal.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 8: include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary.</p> <p>As it is within the parish boundary and planning permission has been given for this development, we support this proposal. This is a perfect example of a fair allocation of the allotted homes in the Draft Core Strategy. The potential for 317 homes to be built in this SHLAA would allow for proposal 2 to be accepted.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 9: include SHLAA sites 603, 2073, 2074 and 2075 in the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development.</p> <p>We support this proposal.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>276</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross</p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 861812</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 276</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>			

criterion?			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>Draft proposal 1: reinstate the buffer zone in the WUE. We support this proposal.</p> <p>At some point between the original and current settlement boundary proposal a significant swathe of land acting as a buffer between the A36 and the proposed 900 houses to the north of Swaledale Road has been lost. We would add "by pulling back the settlement boundary to the beginning of the buffer zone". This land is needed for environmental, noise reduction, natural beauty and other reasons.</p> <p>Draft proposal 2: Attempt to limit the number of homes in the WUE to the 900 originally proposed. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Whilst residents accept that Warminster may have to take the allotted number of dwellings proposed in the draft core strategy, we feel strongly that the allocation should be more fairly shared between east and west Warminster. This is not a case of 'not in my back yard' as we accept that the west must take its fair share of dwellings, but we believe it should be fair. If one ward or another takes more than it's fair share of the allocation, as is likely if this proposal is not accepted, traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues will become extreme.</p> <p>Draft proposal 3: Approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary as originally intended. We support this proposal.</p> <p>We further ask that Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Draft proposal 4: Move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for</p>		

	<p>leisure. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Access to an industrial estate should not be via a residential estate as it would be. The area to the east of Bath Road is far better suited to access for companies. Additionally, we would urge the council to consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites in to the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.</p> <p>Draft proposal 5: include the Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 within the settlement boundary but allocation as employment land only. We DO NOT support this proposal. Whilst we accept that Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained as employment land only.</p> <p>Draft proposal 6: Approve Smallbrook Meadows, St George's playing fields and Yeates Meadow as being outside the settlement boundary. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Draft proposal 7: Request Tynings Allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary, and made into statutory allotments. We support this proposal</p> <p>Draft proposal 8: include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary. It is within the parish boundary and planning permission has been given for this development. We support this proposal. This is a perfect example of a fair allocation of the allotted homes in the draft core strategy. The potential for 317 homes to be built in this SHLAA would allow proposal 2 to be accepted.</p> <p>Draft proposal 9: Include SHLAA sites 603, 2073, 2074 and 2075 on the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development. We support this proposal.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>277</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Ms Rebekah Jeffries <b>Parish Clerk</b>  <b>Rowde Parish Council</b></p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 277</b></p>

		<b>Person ID:</b> 825519	
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Rowde Parish Council discussed the settlement boundaries review at their last Parish Council meeting and decided to agree with the settlement revisions. There was talk about the outlying houses being included in the revised boundary, for example Furlong Close and Devizes Road, & Tanis. However, on the rational that the boundary includes the main developed part of the village and is not representative of parish boundaries, it was agreed to accept the revisions proposed.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you</b>			

<b>have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	278	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Karen Clay <b>Parish Clerk/RFO</b>  <b>Aldbourn Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 390198</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 278</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Aldbourn	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>			

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		Aldbourn Parish Council Objects to the draft proposal for reused settlement boundaries. For the following reasons: 1 - The public and individual land owners have not been given an opportunity for consultation. 2 - The mapping & the description of the changes are not clear enough for the Parish Council to be able to have an informed decision.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	279	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Sharon Neal  Hullavington Parish Council  <b>Person ID:</b> 849874	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 279
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Hullavington	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		At it's last meeting, Hullavington Parish Council has agreed with the revised settlement area proposal.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	280	<b>Consultee:</b> Lt Col  Mike  Whelan <b>Crudwell Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 861973	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 280
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>			

<p><b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>		<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>On behalf of the Crudwell Parish Council, many thanks for giving us the opportunity to comment on the proposed re-drawing of the Settlement Boundary for Crudwell. The proposal was discussed at the Crudwell Parish Council meeting last week and I have been asked to submit our observations.</p> <p>The Council welcome the review of the Settlement Boundary for the village of Crudwell and note that a limited extension to the boundary has been proposed, thus maintaining the land designated as Open Countryside surrounding the village. The major concern raised was the accuracy of the map used as there have been many developments and extensions to properties which might not have been included in the base map document. It is suggested that a more accurate map is used prior to final boundary changes to ensure that no irregularities are put in place that then require lengthy consultation to correct. An example of this is Wellbrook Cottage, sited on the Eastern side of the A429. This property was extended in 1994, but the extension does not appear on the map. As a result, the new boundary includes the original cottage footprint, but not the extension. A reduced thickness of the proposed boundary line would also ease identification of features that are included within the footprint.</p> <p>The remainder of the text was raised as a point by me at the meeting, but is specific to the property that I own and therefore I have a personal interest in the response. The Council were however happy for it to be raised in the overall response:</p> <p>My family live in the part of Crudwell that is currently excluded from the existing Settlement Boundary, but included within a Conservation Area. Under the proposed re-drawing of the Settlement Boundary, our property will still be outside of the Settlement Boundary. We would be one of only two properties East of the A429 and South of the Crudwell/Eastcourt road that is not included. Is there a specific reason for this exclusion?</p> <p>Our property (Ravenscourt) was originally part of the Town Farm complex and was developed in the 1970s, along with two other properties in the complex (Barn House &amp; Wellbrook Cottage). In total, three of the five properties once incorporated within Town Farm are included</p>		

	<p>inside the new Settlement Boundary and two are outside (Ravenscourt &amp; Barn House). In a seemingly further level of inconsistency, one of the properties within the proposed framework has its front garden included but not the rear, one has its entire garden included and another has no garden included at all. This inconsistency appears to have only been applied to the Town Farm complex properties, with all other dwellings and gardens on the Eastern side of the A429 being included in the proposed Settlement Boundary. Given that our property was part of the original Town Farm complex and that we own the access road to one of the properties included within the proposed Settlement Boundary, we would request that our property is included within the new Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>If the proposed Settlement Boundary has only included properties to the East of the A429 with land adjacent to the A429, then again we are eligible for inclusion as we own both land and a driveway that has direct access to the A429. Please could you provide some clarification in regards to the criteria used to include or exclude properties bordering the A429?</p> <p>We also note that extending the proposed Settlement Boundary to include our property would not stray any further into the area currently designated as Landscape Character than any other properties that have been included.</p> <p>We would also request the inclusion of our garden into the Settlement Boundary, as it is no bigger than some of the other properties being included and those buildings designated as ancillary residential. If the inclusion of a garden is a step to far, then we would request the Settlement Boundary be adjusted as shown (pink line) to include our property (and multiple property access driveway). The green line is your proposed new Settlement Boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3145648 (map)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>281</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Alan Watson <b>Person ID:</b> 861979</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 281</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b></p>			

<p>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</p>			
<p>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</p>			
<p>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</p>	<p>Aldbourne</p>	<p>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</p>	
<p>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</p>			
<p>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</p>			
<p>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</p>	<p>I have just found out that you are proposing a revision to the settlement boundary, which affects my property.</p> <p>I have not seen any publicity of this proposal either locally, or in the local press and I am anxious to establish what its effect might be.</p> <p>I should be pleased if you would send me, by return, a map showing the proposed revision, an any written statement setting out the reasons for the change.</p> <p>I am very concerned that landowners affected were not notified of these kinds of changes, so that they have a chance to comment. Presumably if I have any justified comments to make I am not too late.</p>		
<p>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</p>	<p>3145651 (comments)</p>		

<b>Comment ID:</b>	282	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr William Drury <b>WILLIAM DRURY LTD</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391281	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 282
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sutton Benger	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>		We attach an ordnance survey extract showing the two parcels of land that we wish to be included in the structure plan, edged in red.	

<b>to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3145654 (map)	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	283	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 283
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Reduce boundary - residential garden		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>			

<b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	284	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 284
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	17
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Reduce boundary - residential gardens		

<b>proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	285	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 285
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	

<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H8
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Reduce boundary - commercial lorry park		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	286	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 286
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b>	The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.		

<b>criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	16
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Redraw boundary to include residential extension		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	287	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 287
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	

<b>ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	16
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Respondent owns one of these properties Redraw boundary to include 2 X residential properties related to the settlement		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	288	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr. Michael Whelan <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 288

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G9
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Reduce boundary - residential garden		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	289	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr. Michael Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 289
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any</b>		The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a	

<b>additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3146660	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	290	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Whelan  <b>Person ID:</b> 862330	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 290
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Care must be taken to ensure that "removable" boundaries are linked to permanent features. So as to avoid "boundary" creep.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Crudwell	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>			

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The map used for the boundary draft appears to be significantly out of date. Many extensions to existing properties are not shown, nor a number of new properties. It would be advisable to re-draw the boundaries on a more up to date map.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3146661	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	291	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Paul  Cunningham <b>Chair</b>  <b>Netherhampton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 862429	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 291
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Netherhampton	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	E3, E4, E5, E6 and F3, F4, F5, F6
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	Huge area, with no apparent thought re infrastructure and impact on traffic, water, etc		
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?			
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers			
Comment ID:	292	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Paul  Cunningham <b>Chair</b>  <b>Netherhampton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 862429	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 292
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?			
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft			

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Netherhampton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J4, K4, K5, K6, L4, etc
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Huge area, with no apparent thought re infrastructure and impact on traffic, water, etc		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	293	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr. Paul Cunningham <b>Chair</b>  <b>Netherhampton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 862429	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 293

<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Netherhampton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	J9, J10
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Area common to flood		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b>			

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	294	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr. Paul Cunningham <b>Chair</b>  <b>Netherhampton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 862429	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 294
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Netherhampton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	<i>L9, L10, M, 10</i>
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Area common to flood		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>			

<b>what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	295	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Paul  Cunningham <b>Chair</b>  <b>Netherhampton Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 862429</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 295</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Netherhampton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G 10

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Potential removal of sources of employment	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	296	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Michael  Swann  <b>Person ID:</b> 862453	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 296
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft</b>			

<b>settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sutton Veny	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>I wish to register my concerns about the proposed changes to the village boundaries of Sutton Veny. My property (1.Greenhill Gardens BA12 7AY) lies just within the present northern boundary, and has massive brick walls on two sides. The proposed boundary appears to run across my patio, thereby excluding 95% of my back garden from the village. This seems to be a very odd application of planning rules because it means that, while my house remains within the village boundary, my back garden (which includes the tank holding heating oil, and the septic tank) is outside.</p> <p>When I spoke to you on 22 September, I was told thatthere were still three consultation processes to go through, but I have no details of these.</p> <p>I hope that everybody who may be affected will be kept informed of all developments relating to Sutton Veny boundaries, including the form,scope and dates of future consultations.</p>		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	297	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr & Mrs  N & S C  Dowling  <b>Person ID:</b> 862862	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 297

<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Warminster</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Draft proposal 1: reinstate the buffer zone in the WUE. We support this proposal.</p> <p>At some point between the original and current settlement boundary proposal a significant swathe of land acting as a buffer between the A36 and the proposed 900 houses to the north of Swaledale Road has been lost. We would add "by pulling back the settlement boundary to the beginning of the buffer zone". This land is needed for environmental, noise reduction, natural beauty and other reasons.</p> <p>Draft proposal 2: Attempt to limit the number of homes in the WUE to the 900 originally proposed. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Whilst residents accept that Warminster may have to take the allotted number of dwellings proposed in the draft core strategy, we feel strongly that the allocation should be more fairly shared between east and west Warminster. This is not a case of 'not in my back yard' as we accept that the west must take its fair share of dwellings, but we believe it should be fair. If one ward or another takes more than it's fair share of the allocation, as is likely if this proposal is not accepted, traffic congestion and other infrastructure issues will become extreme.</p>		

	<p>Draft proposal 3: Approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary as originally intended. We support this proposal.</p> <p>We further ask that Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Draft proposal 4: Move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for leisure. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Access to an industrial estate should not be via a residential estate as it would be. The area to the east of Bath Road is far better suited to access for companies. Additionally, we would urge the council to consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites in to the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.</p> <p>Draft proposal 5: include the Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 within the settlement boundary but allocation as employment land only. We DO NOT support this proposal. Whilst we accept that Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained as employment land only.</p> <p>Draft proposal 6: Approve Smallbrook Meadows, St George's playing fields and Yeates Meadow as being outside the settlement boundary. We support this proposal.</p> <p>Draft proposal 7: Request Tynings Allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary, and made into statutory allotments. We support this proposal</p> <p>Draft proposal 8: include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary. It is within the parish boundary and planning permission has been given for this development. We support this proposal. This is a perfect example of a fair allocation of the allotted homes in the draft core strategy. The potential for 317 homes to be built in this SHLAA would allow proposal 2 to be accepted.</p> <p>Draft proposal 9: Include SHLAA sites 603, 2073, 2074 and 2075 on the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development. We support this proposal.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	298	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  John  Matthews <b>Chairman</b>  <b>Sherston Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 862921	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 298
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	It is noted that "where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as walls, fences, hedgerows, roads, and water courses". We support this proposition. Indeed any proposed variations to the Sherston settlement boundary via the NP will necessarily adhere to these principles.  As regards the proposed criteria for defining the boundary, we generally support the various suggested reasons for inclusion of land inside the development boundary but would wish to undertake our own review of the existing boundary taking into account any additional allocations identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No – not in all cases. This is a matter that could in our view be better addressed locally via the Sherston NP.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sherston	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Yes – including both any necessary changes to the boundary deriving from any allocations in the emerging Sherston NP and a number of more limited changes to take account of the future development needs of the village.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes</b>	Yes – see our comments above. The timetable is set out in detail above.  <b>Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundary</b>		

what is your anticipated timetable for this work?

**Comments on behalf of Sherston Parish Council**

Sherston is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Indeed it is one of the selected Front Runners. The Neighbourhood Plan area covers the entire Parish of Sherston. A firm of Planning Consultants Foxley Tagg (FTPL) has recently been appointed to assist the Steering Group with the plan-making process and to help bring it to a successful conclusion.

The approved timetable is as follows:

STAGE	ACTION	COMPLETION DATE
1	FTPL TO CHECK EVIDENCE AND UPDATE WHERE NECESSARY	6 <sup>TH</sup> MAY 2014
2	FTPL TO CARRY OUT SITE ASSESSMENTS	6 <sup>TH</sup> MAY 2014
3	FTPL TO PRESENT FEEDBACK TO ANNUAL PARISH MEETING	29 <sup>TH</sup> MAY 2014
4	PLANNING POLICY WORKSHOP	29 <sup>TH</sup> MAY 2014
5	REVIEW OF VISIONS AND OBJECTIVES	BY 13 <sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2014
6	POLICY CREATION WORKSHOP	17 <sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2014
7	DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY OPTIONS	BY 1 <sup>ST</sup> AUG 2014
8	SELECTION OF OPTION SITES	BY 1 <sup>ST</sup> AUG 2014
9	PRODUCTION OF POLICY AND SITE OPTIONS DOCUMENT	BY 22 <sup>ND</sup> AUG 2014
10	CONSULT VILLAGE ON POLICY AND SITE OPTIONS	BY 19 <sup>TH</sup> SEPT 2014
11	ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE FROM VILLAGE	BY 3 <sup>RD</sup> OCT 2014
12	FTPL TO HOLD WORKSHOP ON DRAFTING OF NP	BY 10 <sup>TH</sup> OCT 2014
13	DRAFT NP PREPARED BY STEERING GROUP	BY 24 <sup>TH</sup> OCT 2014
14	DRAFT NP PLAN DOCUMENT FINALISED	BY 31 <sup>ST</sup> OCT 2014
15	FORMAL VILLAGE CONSULTATION ON DRAFT NP	BY 12 <sup>TH</sup> DEC 2014
16	ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES	
17	AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PLAN	
18	SUBMISSION OF DRAFT PLAN TO WILTSHIRE COUNCIL	BY 13 <sup>TH</sup> FEB 2015

19	FORMAL CONSULTATION STARTS – 6 WEEKS	16 <sup>TH</sup> FEB 2015
20	AMEND NP TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF COMMENTS RECEIVED	BY 20 <sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2015
21	SUBMISSION OF NP FOR EXAMINATION BY INSPECTOR	20 <sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2015
22	REFERENDUM	TBA

We have just completed Stage 10 of the programme – albeit have decided that it may be prudent to carry out additional consultation with a range of different interest groups in the village before preparing the draft plan (Stage 13). We are still aiming to be in a position to submit the draft plan for consideration by Wiltshire Council early next year – albeit it is accepted that the timetable may inevitably have to be extended slightly to take account of individual circumstances over the Christmas/New Year period and some additional consultation.

The draft Sherston NP will incorporate a number of proposed changes to the Settlement Boundary – to accommodate additional development (including the allocation of land for a new GP surgery, additional housing, and a range of community facilities).

It is considered that the Steering Group is best placed to consider and recommend any other changes to the settlement boundary – taking into account the criteria suggested in the consultation document. These can be done in the context of the wider Neighbourhood Plan process rather than as an isolated exercise.

In our view it would be inappropriate for Wiltshire Council to continue to prepare a Development Plan Document that seeks to modify the existing Sherston settlement boundary in a manner which took no account of the work that is currently being undertaken by the Parish. It is considered that this is a matter that ought to be left to the local community to decide.

The timetable for preparing the Sherston NP is likely to be ahead of the programme indicated in your consultation document. Thus the final version of your DPP could, if it was felt necessary, incorporate information relating to any approved changes to the Sherston settlement boundary for the sake of completeness.

No – nothing further to add – other than to reiterate the point that we consider that this is a matter for the local community to decide in the context of the emerging Sherston NP.

No – nothing further to add – other than to reiterate the point that we consider that this is a matter for the local community to decide in the context of the emerging Sherston NP.

3154830 (comments)

**Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?**

**Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your**

answers			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	299	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr. Barry Clark <b>Person ID:</b> 862924	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 299
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>		The council has recently submitted a draft building development outline to the Winterslow Parish Council for its comments. The area proposed as being suitable for development is delineated by a green line.	

<p><b>to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>I am extremely concerned that the Parish Council has extended the building area suggested by Wiltshire Council by incorporating land fronting to Middleton Road which can be found between the Village Hall and Woodland Drive. I am convinced that this proposed amendment submitted by the Parish Council should be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land in question is part of land currently subject to an Open Spaces Application which Wiltshire Council has referred to the Planning Inspectorate for the establishment of a Public Enquiry. This Enquiry has yet to be arranged and in these circumstances it is perverse for the Parish Council to recommend that the green line should incorporate this area.</li> <li>2. The Particular area referred to above fronts on to Middleton Road at its narrowest and without pedestrian walkway. This part of the road is frequently the location of difficult passing procedures between public buses, school buses and other commercial vehicles and which provides no pedestrian refuge when these passing procedures are in progress.</li> <li>3. The Parish Council has established a Steering Group under the Localism Act to create a Neighbourhood Plan. The comprehensive survey delivered individually around the village by the Steering Group has revealed that the overwhelming proportion of the residents of Winterslow by implication do not support the extension of the green line as proposed by the Parish Council.</li> </ol> <p>Furthermore, sufficient potential building plots have already been identified to amply provide the additional properties described as being required by the Wiltshire Council Structure Plan. Therefore it is counter-intuitive, and once again perverse, for the Parish Council to extend the green line in the manner described, without having due and proper regard for the information being produced by its own Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. I am aware of no detailed consideration of the appropriateness of the specified land, for building purposes, being carried out by the Parish Council.</li> </ol> <p>I look forward to receiving your comments. In particular I would be interested to learn if you believe that the Parish Council was within its powers to recommend a change to the green line in these circumstances.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3154920 (comments)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>300</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr Simon Fisher</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 300</p>

		<p><b>Deputy Town Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Devizes Town Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID: 550257</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Whilst the Town Council have no concerns with the criteria in relation to the site allocation for residential development it is concerned about extending it to employment land and community use. This concern follows the decision that an allocated employment site on the Horton Road could be developed for housing following a successful appeal by the land owner that there was no interest by developers for its intended purpose.</p> <p>The Town Council strongly recommends that allocation of land for employment and community sites are removed from the criterion this would then support the community's ambition for employment lead development during the current plan period.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Within the criterion under areas that should be excluded the following statement is made, "recreational and amenity spaces on the edge of settlements which primarily relates to the country side (in form or nature)". To the south of the town an importance piece of recreational land adjacent Drews Pond Wood remains within the Settlement Framework Boundary, although it clearly meets this criterion. This land which was the former Roundway Hospital Cricket Ground is now in the ownership of Wiltshire Wildlife trust and provides an import recreational space as well as buffer for the adjacent conversation areas.</p> <p>The Town Council recommends that the Settlement Framework Boundary is amended.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Devizes</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The Town Council believes that there are three fundamental changes that need to be made.</p> <p><b>Change One</b> Recreational land to the south of Thomas Wyatt Road is excluded to meet Wiltshire Councils criterion for amenity spaces (see map).</p> <p><b>Change Two</b> The Steering Group believes that the criterion should preclude areas of land that are only allocated for employment or community use to protect them from unintended residential development.</p>		

	<p>Using the amendment to the criterion for the Settlement Framework Boundary north of Horton Road should be changed (see emap)</p> <p><b>Change Three</b>                  The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is proposing as part of its amendments to the Settlement Framework Boundary that land within a 1600m radius of the town centre should include. This will allow for some suitable site to come forward. (see map)</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Devizes Area Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have looked at the Settlement Framework Boundary in some considerable detail as part for the development of a Neighbourhod Plan and are ready to submit the plan to Wiltshire Council for independent Examination.</p> <p>The Town Council is recommending that the Settlement Framework Boundary as defined by the Steering Group is favoured.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>			
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3155035 (enlarged maps and comments)</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>304</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b>                  Mrs Charmian Spickernell  <b>Person ID:</b> 402713</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 304</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			

<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Pewsey</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Pewsey Settlement Boundary Review 2014</p> <p>I strongly support the change to the boundary in the Ball Road area, bringing the boundary back to the line of the road and the existing dwellings and pub on the east side of the road. My reasons are set out below:                      The Ball Road area is included in the Conservation Area and is one of the oldest parts of Pewsey with many thatched houses and a character that needs protecting.</p> <p>The road itself is narrow, resembling a lane, with high banks and ancient hedgerows in the areas between houses.</p> <p>Many of the houses do not have garages and cars are parked alongside, making the road space even narrower.</p> <p>Two recent developments have only been permitted because they had access from Swan Meadow. Access along Ball Road has not allowed in recent years.</p> <p>The meadow, part of which is included within the present boundary, is used for dog-walking and has established trees and is much used by the residents who value it also for its natural riches.</p> <p>The current boundary that takes in part of the field appears to be an anomaly and it would be excellent if the opportunity to remedy this can be taken with the boundary review.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting</b></p>			

<b>documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	305	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Steve Gray <b>Clerk</b>  <b>Melksham Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 549123	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 305
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Melksham Town Council considers that the methodology used does define the built area of the melksham and BowerHill Settlement.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Melksham Town Council accepts that the boundaries as proposed effectively delinates the current extent of the built area of the settlement. The Town Council recognises that the draft boundaries are tightly drawn and understands why this is the case. However the inevitability of further development, given current and prospective planning applications and the housing requirement defined by the emerging Core Strategy, leads the Town Council to question whether some provision should be made in any settlement boundary proposal for Potential and Proposed Development.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Melksham and Bowerhill	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a</b>		Yes, Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council have committed to geneate a Joint Neighbourhood Plan. It is envisaged that this will take c. 2 years to complete.	

<b>neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	306	<b>Consultee:</b> Col (Retd)  Ian  Blair-Pilling <b>Chairman</b>  <b>Netheravon Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 549094</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 306</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which</b>		<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does</b>	

<b>the boundary relates:</b>		<b>your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		I regret that we have missed your deadline for comment, but wish to register that our parish council considered the proposed revised boundaries at our meeting last week and was content with the changes.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	307	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Cathy Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>  <b>Salisbury City Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 393725	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 307
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted: 1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.	

	<p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Grid ref J4, K4, L4, J5, K5, L5, K6, L6 Hampton Park.</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The new Country Park adjacent to Hampton Park Salisbury should be outside the new settlement boundary rather than included within it. Under the draft methodology this should be considered as 'recreational or amenity space at the edge of communities which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)'.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built</p>		

	<p>area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3160974</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>308</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Cathy  Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>  <b>Salisbury City Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 393725</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 308</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be</p>		

	protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Salisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	Grid ref F6 Bemerton Heath.
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The land within the Folly green space has been included within the proposed settlement boundary when previously it was excluded. It would be better to maintain the green corridor leading to this area – the former housing boundary should be retained at this point [see point 1.3 above].		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	n/a		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 & 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.		

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	309	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Cathy  Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>  <b>Salisbury City Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 393725</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 309</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b>			

<p><b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Grid ref I8 – Imerys Quarry/Fugglestone Red.</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>There should be a gap between the Fugglestone Red strategic development site and the former Imerys Quarry site, see comment re 'green corridors' at 1.3 above. The Imerys Quarry development template in the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy is adjacent to an 'area of undevelopable land' – this is currently included within the settlement boundary and should be excluded from it as part of the gap between Imerys site and Fugglestone Red. The sports grounds to the south of Sarum Academy should also form part of this 'green corridor' and be excluded from the settlement boundary'.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	310	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs  Cathy  Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>  <b>Salisbury City Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 393725	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 310
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park.          Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>	Yes		

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Salisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	Grid ref H8, H9, I9 – Churchfields.
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Around Churchfields, the settlement boundary should not follow the water course but should be set back from the river bank to include a green margin around the site, this would comply with the development template for this site which includes 'green corridors adjacent to the River Nadder' and would also take account of the Flood Zone 3 area adjoining the river.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	n/a		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 & 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	311	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Cathy Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 311</b>

	<p><b>Salisbury City Council</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 393725</p>		
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical 'such as walls, fences, hedgerows' and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a 'large' garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other 'green corridors' which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a 'green corridor' linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Grid ref J10 – Cathedral Close.</p>

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		I do not believe it is appropriate to include the car park at the southern end of the Close within the Settlement boundary, this removes a green corridor stretching in from the River Avon to the Cathedral Close [see point 1.3 above]. Instead the boundary at the SE of the Close should follow the previous line around the housing on De Vaux Place.	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		n/a	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		The emerging Core Policy states that 'some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities' [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 & 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in 'small villages', specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that 'development will be limited to infill within the existing built area'. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these 'small villages' mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the 'small villages' around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as 'small villages' similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	312	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Cathy Titcombe <b>Senior Admin Officer</b>  <b>Salisbury City Council</b>  <b>Person ID: 393725</b>	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID: 312</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>			

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>In general the criteria seem sensible, but the following is noted:</p> <p>1.1 There is a conflict between the settlement boundary following clearly defined physical features where practical ‘such as walls, fences, hedgerows’ and the exclusion of large residential gardens which is one of the other criteria. Under Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) Core Policy 2 there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the limits of development (i.e. within the settlement boundary). It seems somewhat illogical that smaller gardens are proposed for inclusion within the settlement boundary while larger ones are not; as it stands the criteria will potentially lead to much debate over individual plots and what constitutes a ‘large’ garden.</p> <p>1.2 Rather than following water courses there seem to be many instances where the settlement boundary should be kept at a distance from the water course. Building in close proximity to a water course can lead to an unacceptable increase in flood risk (ref WCS Core Policy 67 Flood Risk) and impact on nature conservation interests. In Salisbury saved policy R16 supports the retention of a strip of land adjacent to rivers for public access. Criteria could be changed to add that account will also be taken of relevant designations and planning policies when defining the settlement boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Not only the rivers, but other ‘green corridors’ which lead from the surrounding countryside into the built environment need to be protected from development (see WCS Core Policy 52 Green Infrastructure). The Cathedral Close and The Folly at Bemerton Heath both provide examples where currently there is a ‘green corridor’ linking the site to the open countryside and it is felt this should be retained rather than allowing the Settlement Boundary to break up such corridors (see 3.2 Bemerton Heath and 3.5 Cathedral Close in proposed modifications below).</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Re excluding recreational/amenity space at the edge of settlements - see comment 3.1 below re Hampton Park new Country Park. Re including built up areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement – see comment 3.6 re Petersfinger.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Salisbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>Grid Ref M10 – Petersfinger.</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>The Settlement boundary seems to follow the city boundary at this point when there is housing on Petersfinger Road immediately outside the city boundary which it could be argued is ‘physically/functionally’ related to Salisbury. The city boundary is not one of the criteria for defining the settlement boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b></p>	<p>n/a</p>		

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>The emerging Core Policy states that ‘some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and contribute to the vitality of rural communities’ [WCS 4.16]. Core Policies 1 &amp; 2 provide some guidance re where development should be placed in ‘small villages’, specifically in Core Policy 2 there is a statement that ‘development will be limited to infill within the existing built area’. But what is infill and what is not may be a matter of interpretation given that all these ‘small villages’ mentioned are in reasonable close proximity to the built up area of Salisbury and/or Wilton already and in many cases new proposed developments are planned which will make any gap between these settlements even narrower. For example Ford has development potentially encroaching both from the Bishopdown side and from Old Sarum (which both have settlement boundaries drawn around them). To protect the strategic gap between the ‘small villages’ around Salisbury and the existing and currently planned development in Salisbury should the current housing within these communities defined as ‘small villages’ similarly be within a defined settlement boundary.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	313	<b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey Wood  Mere Parish Council  <b>Person ID:</b> 477226	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 313
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft</b>		Yes	

<p><b>settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Mere</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>K6 &amp; L6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Ivymead Fish Farm - as this is an employment site/brownfield site, members felt that it should be encompassed within the HSB in order to be in accordance with the criterion and to have a consistent approach.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.</p> <p>(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• K7, K8 &amp; L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the</li> </ul>		

	<p>Housing Settlement Boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M10, M11 &amp; M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.</li> <li>• K9 &amp; K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> <li>• J7 &amp; J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House &amp; Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H6 &amp; H7 - St Michael’s Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H5 &amp; H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• I3 &amp; I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>314</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey Wood <b>Person ID:</b> 477226</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 314</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b></p>	<p>Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.</p>		

<p><b>proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Mere</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>M8</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Southbrook – garden at Orchard House - Members felt that it was inconsistent to have this garden within the Housing Settlement Boundary when others have been taken out and members considered that this would be an inappropriate place for development since it is the site of the Southbrook pond and should therefore be taken out of the boundary.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p>		

It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.

(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)

- K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.
- K7, K8 & L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- M10, M11 & M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.
- K9 & K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- J7 & J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House & Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H6 & H7 - St Michael’s Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H5 & H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- I3 & I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied

The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.

<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to</b></p>	<p>3161058</p>
--	----------------

<b>submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	315	<b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey Wood <b>Person ID:</b> 477226	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 315
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Mere	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	17 & 17
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Church Field, Angel Lane + The Vicarage - Members agreed that it was appropriate for this field to be outside the Housing Settlement Boundary. However, if The Chantry and Deans Orchard are within the Housing Settlement Boundary then The Vicarage should also be within the boundary for consistency.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>	Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may		

<p><b>to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.</p> <p>(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• K7, K8 &amp; L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> <li>• M10, M11 &amp; M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.</li> <li>• K9 &amp; K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> <li>• J7 &amp; J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House &amp; Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H6 &amp; H7 - St Michael’s Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H5 &amp; H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 &amp; 14 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3161059	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	316	<b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey  Wood  <b>Person ID:</b> 477226	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 316
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Mere	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G7, G8, F7 & F8
<b>Question 3c - What is your</b>	Nursery sites at Townsend - As this was an employment site/ brownfield site and within the built environment for employment use, members		

<p><b>proposed change?</b></p>	<p>felt that this site should be within the Housing Settlement Boundary for consistency purposes and to be in accordance with the criterion</p>
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.</p> <p>(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• K7, K8 &amp; L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> <li>• M10, M11 &amp; M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.</li> <li>• K9 &amp; K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for</li> </ul>

	<p>employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J7 &amp; J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House &amp; Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H6 &amp; H7 - St Michael's Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H5 &amp; H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• I3 &amp; I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>317</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey Wood <b>Person ID:</b> 477226</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 317</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the</b></p>	<p>Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.</p>		

<p><b>criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Mere</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	<p>C6, B6 &amp; A6</p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Employment land adjacent to Quarryfields Industrial Estate - The Clerk explained that she thought that the new Housing Settlement Boundary included the land allocated for B1 &amp; B2 industrial use (extant planning permission received in 2009 &amp; renewed in 2011) owned by TZZ Estates + the land for the proposed new brush factory site (planning application currently being considered), although the boundary line was not entirely consistent with the planning applications submitted. However, members felt that this line ought to be extended to allow for further employment allocations within the lifespan of the development plan. It was suggested that the line should be extended out to the A303 junction but also that the allocation should be protected in some way so as not to allow residential development.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.</p> <p>(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)</p>		

- K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.
- K7, K8 & L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- M10, M11 & M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.
- K9 & K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- J7 & J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House & Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H6 & H7 - St Michael's Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H5 & H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- I3 & I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied

The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.

**Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers**

<b>Comment ID:</b>	318	<b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey Wood <b>Person ID:</b> 477226	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 318
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Mere	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	H5 & I5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Land behind Castle Hill Crescent/Manor Road - Councillors agreed that the old Housing Boundary should be applied in this instance since it may allow an opportunity for Wiltshire Council to consider a very small low cost housing scheme in the future		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.  Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd		

September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.

I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:

In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.

It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.

(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)

- K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.
- K7, K8 & L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- M10, M11 & M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.
- K9 & K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.
- J7 & J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House & Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H6 & H7 - St Michael's Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- H5 & H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.
- I3 & I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments

		and the criterion applied	
		The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	319	<b>Consultee:</b> Lindsey  Wood  <b>Person ID:</b> 477226	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 319
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		Members felt that the criteria was correct although they felt that there should be a different coloured line or some kind of separation for allocated employment land in order to protect it from being developed for residential purposes.	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		Members felt that there were inconsistencies and that further modifications should be made in order to maintain a consistent approach throughout.	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Mere	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	I3, J3 & J4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Land between Wellhead/Downside Close - Members felt that this was an obvious place for future development and, since the land was owned by the Duchy of Cornwall, could be an avenue to explore for some much needed low cost housing to meet local needs. Members felt that the Housing Settlement Boundary should extend to encompass this field so that controlled development could be an option within the life of the Development Plan.		

<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council is not looking at reviewing the settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>Small Village Settlement Boundaries - Members also agreed that other smaller villages should have settlement boundaries so that they may have the opportunity for controlled growth should they wish.</p> <p>Thank you for extending the consultation deadline to allow us to consider this matter at an extra meeting that was held on Monday 22 nd September. I am attaching the representation form and a copy of our maps with the suggested changes outlined in red pen.</p> <p>I am also detailing below an extract from the Minutes of the meeting at which this was discussed which contains extra comments on the draft HSB changes:</p> <p>In order to answer these questions, the Clerk advised members that they needed to be mindful of the criteria and to ensure that Wiltshire Council had applied a consistent approach in applying the criteria to the new draft settlement boundary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the meeting would go around the boundaries as shown on the map provided, and discuss the changes/issues and whether or not they felt that any amendments should be made.</p> <p>(Changes in separate comments; other comments below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K5 – Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• K7, K8 &amp; L7 – Mill Lane - It was confirmed that historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> <li>• M10, M11 &amp; M12 – Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.</li> <li>• K9 &amp; K10 – Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J7 &amp; J8 - Land behind Michaelmas House &amp; Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H6 &amp; H7 - St Michael's Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• H5 &amp; H6 - Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</li> <li>• I3 &amp; I4 - Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied</li> </ul> <p>The Clerk read through all the above points for clarification and ratification and they were all agreed, without amendment, on proposal made by Cllr. Mrs. Hurd, seconded by Cllr. R. Coward and carried with a unanimous vote.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>322</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Cllr  R. W. Fisher  Amesbury Town Council  <b>Person ID:</b> 863233</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 322</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>		
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft</b></p>	<p>No</p>		

<b>settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Amesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	E112 to E16 & F12 to F18, G14 to G16
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Please see attached plan of proposed changes		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Revision Completed		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	A large part of the development area to the south has been included in the settlement area, that in fact is open access land. It cannot be developed as parts are close to the Boscombe Down Airfield which have hazard areas e.g. Blast areas around bomb dumps, others have been grown over to stone currents, a protected species of bird, or have archaeological feaures which prevent development.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	323	<b>Consultee:</b> Cllr  R. W. Fisher  Amesbury Town Council  <b>Person ID:</b> 863233	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 323
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider</b>	Yes		

<p><b>the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	No		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>	Yes		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	Amesbury	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	H12 to H16 and I14
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	Please see attached plan of proposed changes		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	Revision Completed		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	A large part of the development area to the south has been included in the settlement area, that in fact is open access land. It cannot be developed as parts are close to the Boscombe Down Airfield which have hazard areas e.g. Blast areas around bomb dumps, others have been grown over to stone currents, a protected species of bird, or have archaeological feaures which prevent development.		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	324	<b>Consultee:</b> Cllr R. W. Fisher Amesbury Town Council  <b>Person ID:</b> 863233	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 324
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Amesbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Please see proposed map		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Revision Completed		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant</b>	A large part of the development area to the south has been included in the settlement area, that in fact is open access land. It cannot be developed as parts are close to the Boscombe Down Airfield which have hazard areas e.g. Blast areas around bomb dumps,		

<b>to the boundary review?</b>		others have been grown over to stone currents, a protected species of bird, or have archaeological features which prevent development.	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3161216	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	325	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 325
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	N5-N6, N6-N5
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Remove suggested changes on map in Comment IDs 262 and 265		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement</b>			

<b>boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3167385	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	326	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 326
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> H3-H4-I4

<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Remove suggested changes on map in Comment IDs 266	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3167385	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	327	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Jane Tier <b>Winterslow Parish Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 391900	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 327
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there</b>		Yes	

<b>any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>		Winterslow	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b> H4
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>		Remove suggested changes on map in Comment IDs 267	
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>		3167386	
<b>Comment ID:</b>	328	<b>Consultee:</b> Dr Richard Pagett <b>Person ID:</b> 389605	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 328
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		<p>Question 1 about defining criterion:</p> <p>I think the criteria are rather overly simplistic and make assumptions about sustainable development that are not tenable; just one example, functional proximity is not a proxy for sustainable development.</p>	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider</b>		Question 2 are the proposals drawn in accordance with the criteria?	

<p><b>that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>	<p>Not in all cases, since there is land now included within the “new” boundary that whilst physically close to other buildings is not functionally compliant</p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Purton</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Question 3 proposed areas that should be modified?</p> <p>There is a wealth of local knowledge and thinking that has gone into how to develop the village sustainably and it is disappointing that none of that knowledge appears to have informed the proposals. I really do think that Wiltshire Council could come to the village and discuss with a selected number of villagers who have engaged in community development for years where proposals would be appropriate. None of these people (myself included) is anti-development per se. In fact they do know where would be the best “bits” to develop, where to do some rounding off of the existing boundary and where is just an opening for further much large developments. These people are reflective and opinion formers within the community and carry weight. History shows, that by rushing into putting lines on a map it becomes harder to change that with other lines. Even if one argues that the NP process can be used; it is much harder because once “authority” states a position it turns into a cause celebre and defended to the hilt, despite contrary evidence. It would have been far more respectful to have worked with local people first.</p>		
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>	<p>Question 4 reviewing boundary through the NP?</p> <p>A good question, I believe that we have been misled by Common Places and ill advised. Looking at sites in our NP has been actively discouraged and those who have mentioned the possibility (like me) have been patronised “leave to the experts”. I have written extensively on the sustainability of Purton and it is ridiculous to dismiss a body of work just because it doesn’t “fit” with the current views. Cricklade has now dispensed with C/Places so I do not need to say more.</p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>	<p>I have just learned that there is another round of settlement boundary related consultation and that the period has closed.</p> <p>Given I participated in the previous round earlier this year, I am surprised that I was not informed. But in any event, there was no advertisement in the Community Area Newsletter which is surprising since you relied on that being one of the main ways of alerting residents in the community area to the consultation on the designation of the community area itself. In addition, I have been on the Purton Neighbourhood Plan Working Group since its inception, which is led by Purton Parish Council, and I am surprised that this consultation was never raised.</p> <p>The settlement boundary is one of the single most important aspects to any village, and Purton is no different. This has been reflected in</p>		

		<p>countless village surveys since 1994. I appreciate that it is annoying to be asked to be flexible with rules but I would request, given the above that I am allowed to respond.</p> <p>I quickly provide my comments below:                  Question 5 additional comments?                  I have a lot to say on the matter, and I (plus others I am sure) would welcome a practical, thoughtful and constructive discussion with Wiltshire Council.                  I do hope you can accept my comments to the consultation                  Thank you                  Richard Pagett</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			
<b>Comment ID:</b>	329	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Philip Clark <b>Person ID:</b> 424159	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 329
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please</b>		Sutton Veny	

name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:		Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:	
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?			
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?			
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?	<p><u>Revision of Settlement Boundary.</u>  <u>44 High Street, Sutton Veny, Warminster BA12 7AW</u></p> <p>I OBJECT to the proposed Settlement Boundary for the area at Sutton Veny shown on the location identified in Enclosure 1.</p> <p>1. Referring to Enclosure 2. The Proposed Amendment plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) I own the property at 44 High Street, edged with a <b>red line</b>.</li> <li>b) The Council's proposed Settlement Boundary is the <b>green line</b>.</li> <li>c) My proposed Settlement Boundary is marked with <b>green dots</b>.</li> <li>d) The fields marked <b>X</b> are pasture.</li> </ul> <p>2. My objection is based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The plots marked A and B have both been enjoyed and used as a garden by No 44 for over 30 years.</li> <li>b) Plot B has a Certificate of Lawful Use for Residential Garden granted by West Wiltshire District Council on 23 June 2004.</li> <li>c) A casual glance at the OS map would suggest that the parcels A, B, C and X are all the same height as the High Street. <u>This is most certainly not the case.</u></li> <li>d) A site inspection would immediately show that:</li> </ul>		

	<p>i) Only Plots A, B and C are level with the High Street and,</p> <p>ii) The fields marked X, have a ground level which is 3 or 4 metres <u>above</u> the High Street. They are clearly separated from Plots A, B and C by steep banks (which in the case of B, is topped with a mature hedge). Refer to the photos at Enclosure 3 and 4.</p> <p>3. I propose the Settlement Boundary be adjusted to the dotted green line because,</p> <p>a) It follows the existing <u>ground contours</u> of Plots A and B.</p> <p>b) It is forms a <u>natural and physical demarcation</u> line.</p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	<p>3173891; 3173892; 3173890; 3173889; 3178066</p>		
<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>333</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Mr.  Mark  Donovan  <b>Person ID:</b> 863767</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 333 Mark D</p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>			
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that</b></p>			

<b>should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sutton Veny	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>I live in Sutton Veny, and recently became aware of proposed boundary changes in the village. My address is Bugle Cottage, Bests Lane, Sutton Veny, BA12 7AU.</p> <p>The existing Village boundary follows the boundary of my neighbour's property and mine. This is marked very clearly by fences, shrubbery and very mature trees. I believe the boundary has existed this way for a few hundred years at least.</p> <p>The proposed new boundary crosses my front garden in the middle of a lawn! This makes no sense whatever. There is nothing there to mark the position of the boundary, and I would end up with half of my front garden within the village and the other half outside it. Madness. I get the impression that someone has drawn these lines on a map without looking at the reality on the ground. The driveway and front garden of my house is not as you would expect if you just look at the map.</p> <p>You mentioned when we spoke on the phone that this was being done deliberately where properties back onto open countryside with the deliberate intention of stopping people applying for planning permission. Note that this is my front garden not the back and it is not adjacent to open countryside. To one side there is Bests Lane, another my house and a shared driveway, another the school car park and the last side butts up against the side of a neighbour's garden. Further, the garden has a large number of mature trees throughout. I will need planning permission to maintain these periodically. When doing so I will need to deal with one authority for some of the trees at one end of my garden and a different authority for the trees at the other end of my garden if these proposed changes take place. Madness.</p> <p>Please can you tell me what I need to do to lodge a formal objection to this proposal for changes to the boundary on my property.</p>		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	334	<b>Consultee:</b> Ms Heather Abernethie <b>Town Clerk</b>  <b>Warminster Town Council</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 427919	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 334
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Warminster	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference does your modification relate to:</b>	G9 and 10 (allotments), J7 and 8 (town park)
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Modifications to the boundary are proposed. The green boundary drawn on the plan is accepted as the new settlement boundary but to include a buffer zone on the West urban extension and exclude the Tynings Allotments at Bradley Road and the Town Park and all its land including Warminster Town Football Club.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	The town is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and clarification is being sought from the town council about any further amendments to the settlement boundary.		

---

<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	No
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	3175643

<b>Comment ID:</b>	336	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Steve Wylie <b>Parish Clerk</b> <b>Purton Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID: 840846</b>	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID: 336</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Purton	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	No		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<b>Comment</b>  The Parish Council is making this late submission to the informal consultation because of a discussion with Wiltshire Planning Department over its relationship to the preparation of the settlement boundary. We have been assured by Georgina Clampitt-Dix that our response will be taken into account.  We have considerable misgivings over the logic and rationality of the criteria that you have set out for the boundary of the review process.  We have set out below the proposed criteria in italics followed by our comments on them.  <i>The following draft criterion has been established to help guide the settlement boundary review process.</i>  <i>Draft methodology for consultation</i>  <i>Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features such as roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement.</i>		

---

---

**Comment**

In our view, the area of a settlement is identified by:

- the buildings and structures which it contains and the land which forms the curtilage and
- the recreational or other open land which is attached to the settlement and within the settlement boundary

The word 'practical' is incorrectly used in the definition. If it is to mean anything it should mean 'practicable' (which means 'that which is capable of being carried out or put into effect') but neither of these simply gives licence to change the settlement boundary without any regard to whether the change has any effect to any development which is appropriate to the needs of the community in the area.

- *both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses which are functionally related to the settlement*

**Comment**

The word 'functionally' is too imprecise to be included in the criteria and serves no purpose. A garage and household amenity site located several miles away could be said to be functionally related to the settlement if people use the facilities.

- *existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as recreation grounds and sports halls which are considered to be physically/ functionally related to the settlement*

**Comment**

Delete the word 'functionally' for the same reasons given above.

- *site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, commercial and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.*

**Comment**

Delete the word 'functionally' for the same reasons given above.

*Areas which have been excluded are:*

- *curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement into the surrounding gardens*

**Comment**

This is inappropriate in terms of planning law and practice and simply produces banal results. If a building is within the settlement boundary then the building and its curtilage form a planning unit. To seek to truncate the settlement boundary to exclude areas of land which have been part of the village and within the settlement boundary is inappropriate. The issue of whether a large property within the settlement could have additional information under the usual planning criteria. You appear to have incorrectly used this criterion to exclude areas of land which have been part of the village and within the settlement boundary.

- *recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside*

**Comment**

The words: '*which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)*' are meaningless. You have incorrectly used this criterion to exclude from the Purton Village Settlement the Villages of Purton and Purton.

	<p>appurtenant buildings which are central to the village and which are in the heart of the settlement (including but not limited to the following: <i>isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement buildings, renewable energy installations</i>).</p> <p>You have incorrectly applied this definition to include two employment areas that are not part of the settlement.</p> <p>The word 'isolated' is not useful since, in this context, it means 'far away'. If development as a matter of common sense be part of the settlement. It is not clear why you would use the word 'functionally' in other parts of the methodology. If you look again at this criterion you will see that development which is not part of the settlement will not be regarded as part of the settlement.'</p> <p><b>Part C</b></p> <p>We are disappointed that Wiltshire Council has embarked on such an important project with a haphazard attempt at implementing that methodology by adjusting the settlement boundaries without a wealth of local knowledge and thinking that has gone into how to develop the village. None of that knowledge appears to have informed the proposals.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council has not</p> <p>set out the specific criteria that it has used to produce any of the proposed changes and it is unreasonable to demand that the Parish Council should respond to each piece of feedback.</p> <p>Please do not send out what you have done so far as a draft revised settlement boundary plan.</p> <p>We request that you reconsider the methodology and start again using the existing settlement boundaries. If you make changes, please identify the specific basis on which you consider each change to be necessary and include a key in the plan that you produce.</p> <p>19<sup>th</sup> November 2014</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	337	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Stephen Whitmore <b>Parish Clerk</b> <b>Broad Chalke Parish Council</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 391656	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 337
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	Yes. Our comments are at Part 3c.		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	Mostly.		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Broad Chalke	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	Please also see comments on site options (SHLAA sites) submitted separately. Please refer to attached map: We agree the changes proposed <u>except</u> : We note that the area indicated by an arrow (<---) on the attached map has been proposed for removal from the settlement boundary. This would remove two building plots (at least) in the centre of the village (PO, Pub, Medical Centre, Church). Our neighbourhood plan envisages this as an id or marketable housing. We cannot see why it is proposed for removal (it is not on the map). We therefore request that this potential building land is <u>Retained Within The Settlement</u>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes. We are conducting a <u>Neighbourhood Plan</u> . We have reached the consultation questionnaire and village meetings and drafted the plan itself. We expect to complete the plan by the end of 2015.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Yes. We previously provided a holding reply to the draft proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries (2014) explaining that we were broadly supportive of the proposed changes to Settlement Boundaries. However, we also explained that we would not be in a position to comment on the proposals until our Neighbourhood Planning process had studied them. We are now in a position to comment on the proposals and noting that the consultation process has been delayed we are submitting our comments.		

---

	<p>before the next stage (Formal Consultation).</p> <p>These comments should be read in conjunction with our comments, just submitted, Site Options.</p> <p>You will see that in both cases, our Parish Council sponsored Neighbourhood Plan development issues very positively and we would ask that any further work on both Options is done in conjunction with them. The contact details of the team leader are</p> <p>Ashley Truluck, Anthony's Ground, Broad Chalke, Wiltshire, SP5 5HA.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	338	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Barry Woodcock <b>Person ID:</b> 840846	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 338
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>		Yes, as per Tisbury PC	
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Yes - see below  <b>Re: Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries: SHLAA site -3365, ref: 10546</b> Thank you for your letter of the 3rd February and following your recent consultation with residents of Tisbury for some 37 years, to complement Wiltshire Council for the demand at a time when the demands for more housing are at their greatest.  We divide our response into three sections:  1. In support of the Parish Council's comments on Part B of their response to draft <b>Plan 1. pages(1.1)-(1.5)</b> We have not been shown the Part C response of the Parish Council.  2. Our opposition to the draft revised tightening of the boundary to exclude the specific site <b>2. pages(2.1)-(2.5)</b> This site has recently been granted planning permission for a new house in February 2015. All other changes of the draft settlement boundaries are accepted.  3. An application to seek your support to extend the village boundary to include the site shown on attached sketch <b>Plan 3 pages(3.1)-(3.5)</b> . This field is part of the garden and lies within the current settlement boundary.  The Local Neighbourhood Plan currently being considered by the Committee and the Parish Council has your support. But add we are not a part of the Neighbourhood Plan committee, and avoid		

	<p>above submission.</p> <p>We trust these comments can be considered by Wiltshire Council reference their de hearing from the Council in due course.</p> <p>As a past Parish Councillor I support the work that they do and their response to the boundary for Tisbury <u>Part "B"</u>.</p> <p>I have not been shown Part "C" of the Parish Council's Response - so make no com</p> <p><b>Draft Proposals for the Revised Settlement Boundaries: With particular reference to Tisbury: 22/03/15.</b></p> <p><b>Statement 1:</b></p> <p>We speak as a resident of Tisbury and agree with Tisbury Parish Council, and as I u pending Neighbourhood Plan: That large scale developments tacked onto the outside side, put too great a strain on the infrastructure, and are difficult for a village of our s</p> <p>We are currently experiencing this issue with the Wyndham Place development which period of less than two years. A village the size of Tisbury this is close to a 5% incre Developments of this magnitude tend to attract the larger contractor/developers and They do little to support our own small builders/subcontractors/local labour employm infrastructure which need time to adjust. The community needs time to absorb and i take pride in our community and the uniqueness of our village and its character. We</p> <p>We accept growth is necessary and important to the prosperity of any community, b people in the first place we need a more considered and smaller scale of developm year is a more sensible upper target and would attract local builders/labour helping</p> <p>That said we do recognise and support the future potential development on the old l understand is in the pipeline. We respectfully suggest this should be a mixed use De Employment. The site has for many years been an eye sore for the community with directly over these industrial sheds. The development brief should be for a rural dev character, and should insist that any light industrial/business use premises of large stone/brick/timber with slate roofs rather than crinkly tin. Housing of a mixed nature a proposal we think would be well supported by the community and may well be the We must add we cannot speak for the Neighbourhood Plan Committee.</p> <p>The preferred option for developments in our community would be for local sites of a boundary or where the village boundary can reasonably be amended with minor iron appropriate, but always, after the above, with the upper limit of no more than ten ne</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	339	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Barry Woodcock  <b>Person ID:</b> 840846	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 339
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>		No	
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>		No	
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>		Yes	
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	The proposed changes should not be adopted and the original boundary should stand. The proposal to shorten the village boundary by linking the east corner of Italian Cottages to the original boundary shown on the attached Plan 3. This proposal relates to the Salisbury District Local Plan.		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes - As per Tisbury P.C.		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Yes - See Below  The draft map of the revised settlement boundary has simplified the village boundary at the Parmiter/Station Site, the Avenue car park, the Cottage at Duck St./ Lady Do community area, and the extension to the land take for Wyndham Place Development. But at Gold Hill Gate Ref. (I3-J3) the boundary has been restricted to exclude a new dwelling site. This site has been granted planning permission for a new single dwelling. The redrawing of the village boundary to include the new dwelling site suggests a very odd decision, and may we respectfully say a decision that does not respect the original boundary and its physical + functional features originally defining the settlement.  <b>Draft Proposals for the Revised Settlement Boundaries:  With particular reference to Tisbury: 22/03/15  Statement 2:</b>  Speaking as a resident of Tisbury reference the revised settlement boundary and full details of the proposals submitted by Tisbury Parish Council:		

	<p>No building in gardens is a very blunt instrument at a time of considerable housing need. Density even in rural communities should increase, but at a reasonable level to reflect the character of the area.</p> <p>We accept that some building in the countryside will be necessary in the immediate future, but consideration should be given to an upper limit of not more than 10% of the total area of the village.</p> <p>We also accept that windfall sites will generate a number of opportunities over the period of the plan, but these should be exercised between villages in the Tisbury Community Area.</p> <p>In Summary: Planning Policy should show some flexibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The density of rural homes has to increase to reduce the impact on the environment.</li> <li>• Flexibility has to be shown to village boundaries but not to the extent of the village charter.</li> <li>• Building needs to be carried out in a small scale that can be reasonably absorbed into the community, a scale and character that sits comfortably in the community.</li> <li>• Building in the Country side needs to restrict large scale developments to rural village communities.</li> <li>• Large scale developments should be restricted to major employment sites.</li> <li>• The preferred options would be for local sites of a smaller nature identified within the village boundary can reasonably be amended with minor ironing out of the village boundary.</li> <li>• Building on Brownfield land should proceed alongside windfall sites and be supported by infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	340	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Barry Woodcock  <b>Person ID:</b> 840846	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b> 340
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>	No		
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>	No		
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>	Yes		
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>	Yes as per Tisbury PC		
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Yes see below  We seek Wiltshire Council's support to extend the village boundary to include the field within the Tuckingfold curtilage, as shown on the attached sketch plan <a href="#">Plan 3</a> (hatched) application enquiry of 20th February 2013.. your REF. PE/13/0037. And our response Assessment 23rd April 2014, REF. 10546 + SHLAA Site 3365.  We make no secret of our wish to make a future planning application for a single detached insulated dwelling which will serve our needs in later retirement years should planning permission be granted.  <b>Draft Proposals for the Revised Settlement. Boundaries:</b> <b>With particular reference to Tisbury: 22/03/15</b> <b>Statement 3:</b>  Tuckingfold Field is physically and functionally related to the Tisbury settlement.  It is effectively an infilling of the existing village boundary alignment. It shortens the distance of Italian Cottage to the North Eastern corner/end of the stone boundary wall between the village and the field at Gold Hill Gate. Reference (I 3 -J 3). This Gold Hill Gate site was granted planning permission for a revised settlement boundary seeks to place this yet to be built outside the village boundary.  Tuckingfold Field is within the curtilage of Tuckingfold, it does not have the capacity		

---

	rather would re-align the boundary on pre draft settlement boundary terms as clearly See Plan 3. This is assuming acceptance of our Statement 2. and reinstatement of s Salisbury District Local Plan 2011 in this location.
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	341	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Barry Woodcock <b>Person ID:</b> 840846	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 341
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p><b>Re: Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries: SHLAA site-3365, ref:</b></p> <p>Further to our letter of the 23rd March 2015 we write to add a copy of the Gold Hill C the location of the proposed dwelling and garage approved in February 2015, our pa</p> <p>Our apologies for not including this plan/map within our original submission following our submission.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	342	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Neville Burne <b>Person ID:</b> 894625	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 342
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sherston	<b>Question 3b - Which grid refere your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>		<p>The proposed Sherston Neighbourhood Plan indicates a new boundary line drawn to be situated adjoining the proposed boundary, but excludes the land forming the remainder of the holding. The position of the new line fly in the face of previous planning and common law in the district to a building forms part of that holding. The land is also included as part of the council's own guidelines state, "Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries should include the whole of properties on the boundary of the proposed plan."</p> <p>Additionally the plan still excludes buildings which were part of the original settlement and more modern houses in the village were in existence.</p>	
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	343	<b>Consultee:</b> Mrs Susan Findlay <b>Person ID:</b> 858681	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b> 343
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Tisbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>We have three alterations taking the line back to the existing line.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. REF: C,D/10,11 return to the original blue existing boundary line. This is Mill La</li> <li>2. REF: L/2,3 return to the original blue existing boundary line. This is the north sid</li> <li>3. REF: J/9 return the line around The Old Mill, Scholards Lane to the original blue goes through the river and over land that floods). The line to the east of the road car</li> </ol> <p>We would like to take the proposed boundary further west at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. REF: O/4,5 to include a small piece of land bought by the Parish Council for futur a small marked hard-standing area on the map.</li> </ol> <p>I hope this is clear, but in case it is not I am sending a hard copy with the proposals</p>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			



<b>Comment ID:</b>	345	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Richard Price <b>Person ID:</b> 932551	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Aldbourne	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>This property is a 1795 Late Georgian House with a paddock of c.1 acre and a c.2 acre garden. When I bought it the paddock had planning permission for housing.</p> <p>As a local parish councillor I have recently seen a suggested alteration to the village boundary which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Cuts my garden into 2 pieces using the old wall as part of the boundary and cutting the main lawn;</li> <li>(ii) Cuts the paddock off with no reference to the fact that it is part of the property and we have recently applied to renew as we have given the land to our children.</li> <li>(iii) We wish to retain the old house in its grounds and possibly use the paddock for a garden.</li> </ul> <p>We think the placing of the paddock outside the village boundary does not follow previously accepted boundaries.- see plan.</p> <p>I am surprised that no effort seems to be made to discuss these proposed changes to the land. Why?</p> <p>Your urgent reply and possibly an onsite meeting is requested.</p>		

---

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	
---	--

<b>Comment ID:</b>	346	<b>Consultee:</b> Roger Hicklin <b>Person ID:</b> 391582	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Ramsbury	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>PROPOSED REVISIONS TO RAMSBURY SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY 2015</p> <p>I have noted the current draft of the Ramsbury Settlement Boundary and its amendment of a parcel of land with frontage to Scholar's Lane and a road locally known as Spring Hill, previously excluded.</p> <p>This vegetable garden currently forms part of the property known as The Old Mill on the connection with the two buildings to the east both of which have frontage to Scholar's Lane.</p> <p>From a point standing adjacent to the parcel in question, all the properties visible are within the Conservation Area. From the river bridge, a popular spot for Ramsburians and visitors, allows clear visibility of The Knap and adjoining cottages, one of the village's most prominent features.</p> <p>The exclusion of this land from the Settlement Area has already provided a measure of the withdrawal of an application 15/00608/ FUL.</p> <p>I would request that this parcel of land be retained outside the Settlement Boundary of the village.</p>		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your</b>			



<b>answers</b>	
----------------	--

<b>Comment ID:</b>	347	<b>Consultee:</b> Harlow & Sons <b>Person ID:</b> 412806	<b>Agent:</b> <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Atworth	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	Could the village policy limit be reviewed to go around the entire curtilage of "The Lodge" minute, the revised limit will cut the site in half and tennis court which forms part of the boundary.		
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>			

<b>Comment ID:</b>	348	<b>Consultee:</b> Simon Chambers, LPC Trull Ltd  <b>Person ID:</b> 635979	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Cricklade	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is not prescribed by reference to any development plan framework. The advice at paragraph 55 is more clearly concerning housing, only requiring 'special circumstances' to be presented where 'isolated' new housing is proposed. The sustainable impacts of rural housing are the principal consideration.</p> <p>Recent discussions with the Council's development control officers though, with regard to land immediately adjoin two different settlement framework boundaries, identified in the Core Strategy 2011, and in the face of the Inspector's 10th Procedural Letter, which noted that the physical circumstances, have indicated a slavish adherence to those boundaries and not the historic boundaries in principle.</p> <p>Obviously the advice of paragraph 14 to the NPPF, along with paragraph 55, and the fact that the boundaries are out of date should weigh heavily in favour of the support for the modification.</p> <p>Over and above the representations outlined above regarding the Core Strategy's Policy P1, at this initial stage the purpose of the consultation with regard to the Wiltshire Housing Strategy is to determine the scope of the documents. There is though, as stated above, a cross over in the relevant areas between the two documents.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the potential therefore to advance the housing supply in rural areas (as a result of the suggested review of all settlement boundaries), by simple reference to all villages and hamlets in the open countryside, if the settlement framework boundaries are still to be relied upon, it is an opportunity to indicate a small change at Cricklade which should be included in the Core Strategy and approved residential land on the ground distinct from the open countryside.</p>		

---

---

	(Comments submitted to Regulation 18 Consultation - Comment ID 298)
<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	

<b>Comment ID:</b>	349	<b>Consultee:</b> Mark Reynolds, Professional Planning Services  <b>Person ID:</b> 962627	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Sutton Veny	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>			
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>	<p>1. Introduction and proposals:</p> <p><b>1.01</b> This report has been produced to put forward a parcel of land to be included under the forthcoming Wiltshire Housing site allocations DPD.</p> <p><b>1.02</b> The site lies adjacent to the village policy limit of the settlement and has been the site is located on the northern side of Norton Road to the west of the Pound Barton which services the terraced properties known as the Kennels. The site is part of a larger site to the east of this site which is currently the subject of a planning application with the Council.</p> <p><b>1.03</b> The adjacent piece of land to the east is being brought forward separately a village policy limit at present. However if the currently proposed parcel of land can be included in the plan allow for a comprehensive form of redevelopment.</p> <p>2. justification for inclusion of the land in the emerging dpd</p> <p><b>2.01</b> The Core Strategy Inspector concluded that Wiltshire Council's existing settlement boundary was understood that a consultation period took place which closed on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015. At this point the parcel of land which is now being put forward was not included in the plan making process at the time of the initial consultation.</p> <p><b>2.02</b> The LDS advises that between February and March 2016 formal consultation on the Core Strategy Plan with a view to the plan being submitted to PINS in July 2016. Given this timescale it is essential to proceed without delay because the owner of the site would like it to be included within the revised settlement boundary.</p>		

---

---

published as part of the Pre-submission Draft Plan

### **Character and appearance**

**2.03** The site itself is rather oddly excluded from the settlement boundary. As can be seen to the west and east of the site includes the land running parallel with the northern tip of the land within the village policy limit it would allow for the logical rounding off of the settlement boundary does not follow any clearly defined physical features e.g. walls or fences should exclude the land currently sought to be included.

**2.04** The land in question is a small parcel of land which is currently unused. It is situated to the north which is actively farmed. The strip of land is of inadequate size to be used for agricultural use to the north. The land has consequently lay unused for a number of years and hence if the land was given a productive use for residential development then this would provide a contrast to its visual appearance.

**2.05** The land to both the west and east of the site exhibits buildings pushed as far as possible in giving guidance on how settlement boundaries will be revised provides some useful examples of land included within settlement boundaries. These being curtilages of properties, which could be used for recreational or amenity space at the edge which primarily relate to the countryside; it is not visually detached from the settlement.

**2.06** The proposed site would clearly not result in an extension of the built form of the settlement behind the building line established by the Pound Barton Estate to the east and the Kennels to the west. The proposed site is not an area of recreational or amenity space so there would be no visual impact on the village. The site is not physically or visually detached from the settlement. Indeed with the Kennels this would make the central facilities of Sutton Veny very accessible on the village policy limit would not therefore fall foul of any of the reasons for exclusion of land. The site is located surrounded on three sides by the existing policy limit and would provide a logical extension of the need to extend the built form of the settlement into visually open countryside.

### **Housing need**

**2.07** Policy CP1 identifies Warminster and its associated community area, of which the site is part, to deliver a large proportion of the required housing for the North and West Wiltshire Housing Strategy.

**2.08** The Council's Housing Land Supply Statement April 2014 outlines a requirement for housing over the period 2014-19 to realise a 5 year supply of deliverable housing. It goes on to state that from 2020 through to 2025/26 an annual small windfall allowance of between 114-135 dwellings per annum is required. The delivery of such sites which was for example 35 in 2014/15 and 89 in 2015-16. This is to ensure that sites are permitted and developed to ensure that a lack of supply of housing does not undermine the housing land supply.

**2.09** At present the Council's position is that for the North and West Wiltshire Housing Strategy to be met a supply of housing is required. This does not leave much margin in the supply in the event that any of the land is not developed forward in the timescales anticipated. It is therefore argued that the benefit which would be derived from residential development is significant.

**2.10** National policy through the NPPF is likewise supportive of housing in general and paragraph 47 'to boost significantly the supply of housing'. Councils are required in the same paragraph to meet the need for housing within their area.

**2.11** Paragraph 55 deals with the need to provide housing in rural areas. Noting that the purpose is to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example where there are gaps in services one village may support services in a village nearby. The NPPF is supportive of development in Sutton Veny as a 'large village' needs windfall development such as this to support the main

	<p>facilities at the village.</p> <p><b>2.12</b> The settlement of Sutton Veny has seen very limited growth over recent years. A survey conducted in 2014 found a lot of local support for further housing within the Parish and a need in particular for affordable housing. This current site could accommodate a small cluster of dwellings to meet the evidence based community need identified through the Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p><b>2.13</b> The existing settlement boundary for Sutton Veny is drawn tightly around the existing development. This has significantly constrained the settlement in terms of housing growth. A number of dwellings have been approved within the settlement. It is allocated as a large village to accommodate some growth because it represents one of the most sustainable locations within the Community Area. Delivering the enhanced rate of windfall development required by the Local Plan is a key priority for housing delivery within Sutton Veny.</p> <p><b>2.14</b> On the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2015 the Government released a paper 'Consultation on the future of planning policy' upon which comments are sought until the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2016. The key theme of the future of planning policy is centred on delivering increased rates and levels of housing supply. The consultation document recognises a significant shortage in small housing sites coming forward. The Government's approach is for 'proposals for development on small sites immediately adjacent to existing development to be considered and supported if they are sustainable'.</p> <p><b>2.15</b> This application site is located sustainably as described in the below paragraphs in line with the Government's intention to increase housing supply. The consultation document confirms that this new policy is very likely to be adopted through changes to the NPPF and NPPG and therefore represents an important material consideration.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p><b>2.16</b> The site being proposed is located in a sustainable location in close proximity to the village. A Pub is located 250m to the west of the site and there is a bus stop on the High Street through the village, Warminster being the most frequently accessible destination within the village.</p> <p><b>2.17</b> The village is served by a primary school, nursing home, Sutton Veny House and a GP surgery within comfortable walking distance on a flat route from the site site. It is considered that most of the dwellings would not need to own a car to live at these properties.</p> <p>Please note: Land to the east has now secured planning permission.</p>
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b></p>	

<p><b>Comment ID:</b></p>	<p>350</p>	<p><b>Consultee:</b> Robert Quartley – Quartley Surveyors</p> <p><b>Person ID:</b> 538353</p>	<p><b>Agent:</b></p> <p><b>Person ID:</b></p>
<p><b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the</b></p>			

proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?		
Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?		
Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?		
Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:	Westbury	Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:
Question 3c - What is your proposed change?	<p>I have been advised that you are the person to contact with regard to a possible alteration to the boundary.</p> <p>I act for the Institute of Engineering Designers who own and have their offices at C...</p> <p>I attach two plans on one pdf. One is the land registry plan showing their boundary which is included in the settlement boundary as shown on the other plan, which I have...</p> <p>It would appear logical that the boundary line be moved to include the whole of the...</p> <p>If you are not the person I should be grateful if you could direct to the right department...</p>	
Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?		
Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?		
Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers		

Comment ID:	351	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr David Langton  <b>Person ID:</b> 906566	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b>
Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?			

<p><b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b></p>	<p>Ramsbury</p>	<p><b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b></p>
<p><b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b></p>	<p>Suggested amendment to the settlement boundary at the land adjacent to Anvil Cottage, Newtown Road, Ramsbury known as the 'Black Barn'</p> <p>We note that the proposed settlement boundary which is under consideration at present is shown on the map as the green line. Anvil Cottage, known as the Black Barn, as indicated by the green line. This is shown on maps are shown on pages 3 &amp; 4.</p> <p>We request that the boundary is moved further East to align with the property boundary of the land as shown by the black dotted line in the above diagram.</p> <p>We would agree that the proposed settlement boundary should include the entire parcel of land as it supports the government and Wiltshire's Core Strategy to identify new developable land to meet the requirements.</p> <p>The parcel of land is particularly suitable for re-development for housing as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjoins the current settlement boundary</li> <li>• Is outside the conservation area</li> <li>• Is re-using land that has been previously developed</li> <li>• There are existing structures on the site</li> <li>• Is far closer to the centre of Ramsbury than much of the rest of the settlement</li> <li>• Already has its own access and there is sufficient land within its curtilage to allow for a dwelling</li> <li>• Is within the 30 mph zone</li> <li>• Has immediate access to a pavement just across the road</li> <li>• Is outside of the flood plain of the River Kennet</li> </ul> <p>It will allow for the creation of a dwelling in a sustainable location that would support the settlement's needs for a school, shops and pubs – being within easy walking distance of all of these amenities.</p>	
<p><b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b></p>		
<p><b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting</b></p>		

documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers

<b>Comment ID:</b>	352	<b>Consultee:</b> Mr Russell Evans  <b>Person ID:</b> 1008849	<b>Agent:</b>  <b>Person ID:</b>
<b>Question 1 - Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?</b>			
<b>Question 2 - Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?</b>			
<b>Question 3 Group - Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement Boundaries that should be modified?</b>			
<b>Question 3a - If yes, please name of the settlement to which the boundary relates:</b>	Shaw	<b>Question 3b - Which grid reference your modification relate to:</b>	
<b>Question 3c - What is your proposed change?</b>	<p>I have attached a copy of the graphic I have been referring to. I have annotated on to understand.</p> <p>My concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Albeit subject to relevant planning permission, residents in houses 9-12 &amp; 16a or in their back gardens</li> <li>2. There is an ugly rumour that the owner of the agriculture land is intending to apply for a building line on Shaw Hill. I have wondered if this anomalie of the building line is intended to facilitate</li> <li>3. I have nor received any contact in order for consultation about this change</li> <li>4. Why is No 13 &amp; 14 particularly impacted ?</li> </ol>		
<b>Question 4 - Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?</b>			
<b>Question 5 - Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?</b>			


---

<b>Supporting documents - If you have any supporting documents that you wish to submit in conjunction with your answers</b>	
---	--

---

## Appendix C – Consultation materials

### a) Leaflet



## Introduction

This document sets out the proposed methodology to review the existing boundaries and how Town and Parish Councils can inform the process.

This informal consultation with Parish and Town Councils on the methodology and draft proposals relating to the review of settlement boundaries will last 8 weeks, finishing on Monday 22 September 2014.

Comments at this stage are invited on the appropriateness of the methodology (see page 3) and proposed revisions to boundaries. The responses will be used to develop the proposals for inclusion in the draft plan.

You will find with this document a map(s) showing the current and revised settlement boundaries for your parish. All settlement boundaries can be viewed online via the council's website at:

<http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal>

## What are settlement boundaries?

The Wiltshire Core Strategy presents a settlement strategy for managing growth over the period up to 2026. The strategy establishes tiers of settlements based on an understanding of their role and function; and how they relate to their immediate communities and wider hinterland.

The Wiltshire Core Strategy identifies four categories of settlements, namely:

- Principal Settlements
- Market Towns
- Local Service Centres
- Large Villages and Small Villages

The Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages have defined settlement boundaries.

In simple terms, a 'settlement boundary' is the dividing line, or boundary between areas of built/urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development – the open countryside.

The settlement boundaries were originally defined in the Kennet Local Plan 2011, North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011, West Wiltshire Local Plan 1st Alteration 2004 and Salisbury District Local Plan 2011.

---

A variety of terms to describe settlement boundaries are used in these documents as follows:

- Kennet Local Plan – Limits of Development
- North Wiltshire Local Plan – Framework of Settlement
- West Wiltshire Local Plan – Town Policy Limits and Village Policy Limits
- Salisbury District Local Plan – Housing Policy Boundary
- In the Wiltshire Core Strategy, settlement boundaries are described as Limits of Development

The Wiltshire Core Strategy presents a general presumption in favour of sustainable development within the settlement boundaries of Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages. Other than in circumstances, as permitted by other policies within the Core strategy, development will not be permitted outside the defined settlement boundaries. The settlement boundaries may only be altered through the identification of sites for development through site allocations and neighbourhood plans.



The Wiltshire Core Strategy is currently being examined and the Planning Inspector, has highlighted that the extant boundaries were adopted some years ago. As a consequence Wiltshire Council is undertaking a comprehensive review of the boundaries to ensure they are up-to-date for the purposes of the Core Strategy plan period (i.e. 2006 - 2026).

The council is preparing a Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). This informal consultation forms part of the preparation of that DPD. The DPD will do two things:

1. It will review all settlement boundaries in the Wiltshire Core Strategy (see page 3).
2. Identify, where necessary, new allocations for housing at settlements to provide for additional housing to help meet the Core Strategy housing requirement.

Please submit your views on the Draft Proposed Settlement Framework Boundaries using one of the following methods:



## Draft methodology for consultation

The following draft criterion has been established to help guide the settlement boundary review process.

Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement.

Areas which have been included are:

- both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement
- existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement
- site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.

Areas which have been excluded are:

- curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens
- recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)
- isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).

3

### Wiltshire's Settlement Boundaries

#### Principal Settlements

Chippenham*	Trowbridge
Salisbury	

#### Local Service Centres

Cricklade	Pewsey
Market Lavington	Downton
Mere	Tisbury
Wilton	

#### Market Towns

Bradford-on-Avon	Calne
Corsham	Malmesbury
Melksham and Bowerhill village	Royal Wootton Bassett
Warminster	Westbury
Deveses	Marlborough
Tidworth	Ludgershall
Amesbury (Bulford and Durrington)	

#### Large Villages

Porton	Kington St Michael
Shrewton	Potterne
Tilshead	Rowde
The Winterbournes	Urchfont
Alderbury	West Lavington / Littleton Panell
Coombe Bissett	Worton
Morgan's Vale / Woodfalls	Aldbourne
Pitton	Baydon
Whiteparish	Broad Hinton
Winterslow	Ramsbury
Fovant	Burbage
Hindon	Great Bedwyn
Ludwell	Shalbourne
Broadchalke	Upavon
Dinton	Collingbourne Ducis
Holt	Netheravon
Westwood	Great Wishford
Winsley	Yatton Keynell
Sutton Benger	Coleme
Bromham	Oaksey
Great Somerford	Sherston
Rudloe	Atworth
Box	Seend
Ashton Keynes	Semington
Crudwell	Shaw / Whitley
Studley / Derry Hill	Steeple Ashton
Christian Malford	Hullavington
Lyneham	Codford
Purton	Corsley
Hilperton	Heytesbury
North Bradley	Sutton Veny
Southwick	Bratton
Chapmanslade	Dilton Marsh

\* Excluded from the settlement boundary review process. To be undertaken as part of the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD.

## Are you developing a neighbourhood plan?

If you have, or are intending to look at settlement boundaries as part of your neighbourhood plan, we are keen to understand any work you have undertaken and the timetable for your plan. This will help us understand the relationship between the two processes.

Additionally if you have established a steering group you may wish to consult them in formulating your response to this consultation.

## We are inviting responses to the following questions (please qualify your answers)

Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?

Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?

Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement boundaries that should be modified?

Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?

Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?

Please see page 6 for details on how to submit your comments.





The timetable for preparing the Site Allocations DPD updates the information presented in the Local Development Scheme (March 2014).

The council is hosting briefing sessions as follows for those parishes affected by the settlement boundary review process:

Date	Venue	Time
Monday 28 July	Calne Town Hall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Tuesday 29 July	Salisbury Guildhall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Wednesday 30 July	Trowbridge Civic Centre	6:00pm – 7:00pm

Invitations to the workshops are limited to two representatives from each Parish / Town Council. If you have not provided us with details of the representative(s) who you intend to send and wish to attend please contact: Daniel Wilson; [daniel.wilson@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.wilson@wiltshire.gov.uk); 01225 713428.

## How to comment



Online: <http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal>

Email: [spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk)

By Post:

Representation forms are available on the council's website at the address above.


Spatial Planning, Wiltshire, County Hall, Bythesea Rd,  
Trowbridge, Wiltshire BA14 8JN

Please note that all comments and the name of the parish responsible for them will be on public record, and will be made available to view on the council's website.

### Further information

For further information, contact the Spatial Planning Team by telephone 01225 713223

or by email [spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk).



---

**b) Letter**

---

## **Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan – Update for Town and Parish Councils**

The council is developing a plan to support the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy and the delivery of new housing sites over the period up to 2026.

As outlined in the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS), the 'Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)' will perform two roles. Firstly, it will identify site allocations to deliver new homes over the period up to 2026 to ensure that a 5 year land supply can be maintained across the Plan period; and secondly, it will undertake a review of existing 'settlement boundaries', as defined currently in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.

In preparing the DPD, the focus to date has been to undertake consultation on the scope of the plan (24 March to 5 May 2014) and on developing criteria for reviewing settlement boundaries. A significant number of potential site options for assessment have been submitted to the Council, all of which are being considered through an initial screening process.

At this stage, an initial, informal consultation with Parish and Town Councils on the methodology and draft proposals relating to settlement boundary reviews will commence on **28 July 2014** and last 8 weeks, finishing on **Monday 22 September 2014**. Parish and Town Councils will be sent an information pack regarding the review of settlement boundaries in relation to their parished area. The packs will provide details of existing and, where necessary, proposed revisions settlement boundaries, alongside the methodology. Comments will be invited on the appropriateness of the methodology and the proposed revisions of boundaries. The responses will be used to develop the proposals for inclusion in the 'pre-submission' draft of the plan.

The council are hosting three focussed briefing sessions as follows for those parishes affected by the settlement boundary review process:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Time</b>
Monday 28 July	Calne Town Hall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Tuesday 29 July	Salisbury Guildhall	6:00pm – 7:00pm
Wednesday 30 July	Trowbridge Civic Centre	6:00pm – 7:00pm

Invitations to the workshops are limited to a maximum of two representatives from each Parish / Town Council. For the purposes of administering the events, please notify us as soon as possible with details of the representative who you intend to send? Attendee details should be sent to: Daniel Wilson; Assistant Planning Officer, [daniel.wilson@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.wilson@wiltshire.gov.uk); 01225 713428.

Alistair Cunningham  
Associate Director, Economic Development and Planning

<b>North &amp; West Housing Market Area</b>	<b>East Housing Market Area</b>	<b>South Housing Market Area</b>
<b>Principal Settlement</b>	<b>Principal Settlement</b>	<b>Principal Settlement</b>
Chippenham *		Salisbury
Trowbridge		
<b>Market Town</b>	<b>Market Town</b>	<b>Market Town</b>
Bradford-on-Avon	Devizes	Amesbury (including Bulford and Durrington)
Calne	Marlborough	
Corsham	Tidworth	
Malmesbury	Ludgershall	
Melksham (and Bowerhill village)		
Royal Wootton Bassett		
Warminster		
Westbury		
<b>Local Service Centre</b>	<b>Local Service Centre</b>	<b>Local Service Centre</b>
Cricklade	Pewsey	Downton
	Market Lavington	Mere
		Tisbury
		Mere
		Wilton
<b>Large Village</b>	<b>Large Village</b>	<b>Large Village</b>
Holt	Bromham	Great Wishford
Westwood	Potterne	Porton
Winsley	Rowde	Shrewton
Studley / Derry Hill	Urchfont	Tilshead
Christian Malford	West Lavington / Littleton Panell	The Winterbournes
Hullavington	Worton	Alderbury
Kington St Michael	Aldbourn	Coombe Bissett
Sutton Benger	Baydon	Morgan's Vale / Woodfalls
Yatton Keynell	Broad Hinton	Pitton
Colerne	Ramsbury	Whiteparish
Rudloe	Burbage	Winterslow
Box	Great Bedwyn	Fovant
Ashton Keynes	Shalbourne	Hindon
Crudwell	Upavon	Ludwell
Great Somerford	Collingbourne Ducis	Broad Chalk
Oaksey	Netheravon	Dinton
Sherston		
Atworth		
Seend		
Semington		
Shaw / Whitley		
Steeple Ashton		

---

Lyneham		
Purton		
Hilperton		
North Bradley		
Southwick		
Chapmanslade		
Codford		
Corsley		
Heytesbury		
Sutton Veny		
Bratton		
Dilton Marsh		
*Excluded from the settlement boundary review process. To be undertaken as part of the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD.		

---

**c) Presentation**

Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

## Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries

### Town and Parish Council Briefing

Geoff Winslow and Christopher Minors  
28 July 2014


### Presentation overview

- What are Settlement Boundaries?
- Why are the boundaries being reviewed?
- What are we seeking comment on?
- How does this work fit with neighbourhood planning?
- How can you provide comment?
- What are the next steps?

Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

### What are Settlement Boundaries?

- In simple terms, a 'settlement boundary' is the dividing line, or boundary between areas of built/urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development – the open countryside.



Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

### Variety of terms

- Kennet Local Plan – Limits of Development
- North Wiltshire Local Plan – Framework of Settlement
- West Wiltshire Local Plan – Town Policy Limits and Village Policy Limits
- Salisbury District Local Plan – Housing Policy Boundary
- Wiltshire Core Strategy – Limits of Development



Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

### Settlement strategy

- Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages
- Settlement boundaries seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations throughout Wiltshire
- Other than in circumstances, as permitted by other policies within the Core Strategy, development will not be permitted outside the defined settlement boundaries

Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

### Why are the boundaries being reviewed?

- The Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector has highlighted that the boundaries were originally adopted some years ago
- As a consequence Wiltshire Council has agreed to undertake a comprehensive review of the boundaries to ensure they are up-to-date for the purposes of the Core Strategy plan period (i.e. 2006 - 2026)



Wiltshire Council  
Where everybody matters

### Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

- This informal consultation forms part of the document's preparation. Once finalised, the document will do two things:
1. It will review all current settlement boundaries in the Wiltshire Core Strategy
  2. Identify, where necessary, new allocations for housing at settlements to provide for additional housing to help meet the Core Strategy housing requirement

### What are we seeking comment on?

- We are seeking comment on the method used to review the boundaries; and
- Whether you consider that the proposed settlement boundaries accord to this method; and
- Are there any areas of the draft boundaries that should be modified; and
- Details of any review to your boundary you're undertaking as part of a neighbourhood planning process.

### Draft methodology

- Where practical, the draft settlement boundaries follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement.





### Areas which have been included are:

- both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement
- existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically / functionally related to the settlement
- site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement

### Areas which have been excluded are:

- curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens
- recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature)
- isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations)





### How does this work fit with neighbourhood planning?

- Neighbourhood Plans need to be in 'general conformity' with the development plan
- Any proposed amendments to a boundary will need to reflect the overall strategy for delivering the development strategy for the area
- It is likely that the Site Allocations document will include specific guidance/policy for neighbourhood plans

### What are the next steps?

Plan preparation	Formal consultation	Submission / Examination	Adoption
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence gathering</li> <li>• Assessments</li> <li>• Informal consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise Plan</li> <li>• Formal 6-week consultation on 'Draft Plan'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise plans and relevant submission statements</li> <li>• Hearing sessions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receipt of inspector's Report</li> <li>• Adoption</li> <li>• Commence 6 week legal challenge period</li> </ul>
Up to November 2014	January – March 2015	April – November 2015	December 2015

### How can you provide comment?

- Maps sent to all parishes affected by the review
- Maps show current and draft proposals
- Grid system to aid representations
- Maps are also available to view online



### How can you provide comment?

- Online: <http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal>
- Email: [spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk)
- By post: Spatial Planning, County Hall, Bythesea Rd, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 8JN

Representation forms are available on the councils website above

### Questions?



---

**d) Representation form**

**Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)**  
**Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries**  
**Informal Consultation with Parish and Town Councils**

Please return to Wiltshire Council, by 5pm on Monday 22 September 2014.

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>(For official use only)</b>
-------------	--------------------------------

**By post to:** Spatial Planning, Wiltshire Council, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 8JN.

**By e-mail to:** [spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:spatialplanningpolicy@wiltshire.gov.uk)

**Tel:** 01225 713223

**Website:** <http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal>

This form has three parts:

Part A – Parish / Town Council details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Part C - Comments on any specific areas of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries

**Part A – Parish / Town Council details**

1. Parish / Town Council details	
Contact title (i.e. Mr/Mrs/Dr etc.)	
Contact first name	
Contact last name	
Parish/Town Council name	
Address Line 1	
Address Line 2	
Address Line 3	
Address Line 4	
Postcode	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	





---

## Appendix D – Specific comments on individual settlements

---

## Contents

### Part 1: Specific comments on individual settlements

Principle Settlements	505	Ashton Keynes	551
Salisbury	505	Atworth	551
Trowbridge	507	Baydon	552
Market Towns	508	Box	552
Amesbury	508	Bratton	552
Bulford	509	Broad Chalke	552
Durrington	512	Broad Hinton	553
Bradford on Avon	512	Bromham	553
Calne	520	Burbage	553
Corsham	523	Chapmanslade	555
Devizes	526	Christian Malford	556
Ludgershall	528	Codford	556
Malmesbury	528	Colerne	559
Marlborough	529	Collingbourne Ducis	559
Melksham & Bowerhill	529	Coombe Bissett	560
Royal Wootton Bassett	531	Corsley	561
Tidworth	531	Crudwell	561
Warminster	532	Dilton Marsh	563
Westbury	534	Dinton	564
Local Service Centres	540	Fovant	564
Cricklade	540	Great Bedwyn	564
Downton	541	Great Somerford	564
Market Lavington	541	Great Wishford	565
Mere	542	Heytesbury	565
Pewsey	547	Hilperton	565
Tisbury	547	Hindon	568
Wilton	549	Holt	568
Large Villages	550	Hullavington	568
Aldbourn	550	Kington St Michael	568
Alderbury	550	Luwde	568
		Lyneham	569
		Morgan's Vale & Woodfalls	569
		Netheravon	569
		North Bradley	569

---

Oaksey.....	569	Sutton Benger .....	578
Pitton.....	570	Sutton Veny .....	579
Porton .....	570	The Winterbournes.....	581
Potterne .....	570	Tilshead.....	581
Purton .....	570	Upavon.....	581
Ramsbury .....	570	Urchfont.....	582
Rowde .....	572	West Lavington & Littleton Panell .....	585
Rudloe .....	572	Westwood.....	589
Seend .....	573	Whiteparish .....	589
Semington.....	574	Winsley .....	591
Shalbourne .....	574	Winterslow.....	591
Shaw / Whitley.....	574	Worton.....	593
Sherston .....	574	Yatton Keynell.....	594
Shrewton.....	575	Part 2: Maps Submitted With Comments On Individual Settlements.....	594
Steeple Ashton .....	577		
Studley / Derry Hill.....	578		

## Part 1: Specific comments on individual settlements

### Principle Settlements

#### Salisbury

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The new Country Park adjacent to Hampton Park Salisbury should be outside the new settlement boundary rather than included within it.</b>	J4, K4, L4, J5, K5, L5, K6, L6 Hampton Park	Reg Williams (117) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. Leave outside boundary.
<b>The land within the Folly green space has been included within the proposed settlement boundary when previously it was excluded. It would be better to maintain the green corridor leading to this area – the former housing boundary should be retained at this point.</b>	F6 Bemerton Heath	Reg Williams (118) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. Leave outside boundary.
<b>There should be a gap between the Fugglestone Red strategic development site and the former Imerys Quarry site, see comment re 'green corridors' above. The Imerys Quarry development template in the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy is adjacent to an 'area of undevelopable land' – this is currently included within the settlement boundary and should be excluded from it as part of the</b>	I8 – Imerys Quarry/Fugglestone Red	Reg Williams (119) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. Allocations are now excluded from the settlement boundary.

<p>gap between Imerys site and Fugglestone Red. The sports grounds to the south of Sarum Academy should also form part of this 'green corridor' and be excluded from the settlement boundary'.</p>			
<p><b>Around Churchfields, the settlement boundary should not follow the water course but should be set back from the river bank to include a green margin around the site, this would comply with the development template for this site which includes 'green corridors adjacent to the River Nadde</b></p>	H8, H9, I9 – Churchfields	Reg Williams (120) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. The settlement boundary will follow the built up area.
<p><b>I do not believe it is appropriate to include the car park at the southern end of the Close within the Settlement boundary, this removes a green corridor stretching in from the River Avon to the Cathedral Close. Instead the boundary at the SE of the Close should follow the previous line around the housing on De Vaux Place.</b></p>	J10 – Cathedral Close	Reg Williams (121) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. Exclude car park from settlement boundary.
<p><b>The Settlement boundary seems to follow the city boundary at this point when there is housing on Petersfinger Road immediately outside the city boundary which it could be argued is 'physically/functionally' related to Salisbury.</b></p>	M10 – Petersfinger	Reg Williams (122) Salisbury City Council (307)	Accept. Include housing within settlement boundary.

## Trowbridge

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officers Comments
<b>Trowbridge Town Council supports the inclusion of the site bounded to the south by the stream, to the West by frome Rd, to the North by Old Brick Fields and to the East by Spring Meadows and which is being promoted by Newland Homes.</b>	ST 844 562  (F9 & G9)	Trowbridge Town Council (60)	Reject. Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary.
<b>The Town Council also notes the inclusion within the settlement boundary of the remaining land to the South of Green Lane which has not so far been included as part of the strategic site and the Town Council supports the inclusion of this area.</b>	?  (K,L 7?)	Trowbridge Town Council (60)	Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary unless the development has commenced.
<b>See attached.</b>	See map 1	G.F. Menzies	Reject. Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary.

## Market Towns

### Amesbury

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
A large part of the development area to the south has been included in the settlement area, that in fact is open access land. It cannot be developed as parts are close to the Boscombe Down Airfield which have hazard areas e.g. Blast areas around bomb dumps, others have been grown over to stone currents, a protected species of bird, or have archaeological features which prevent development.		Amesbury TC (322, 323, 324)	Noted.
See attached plan	E112 to E16 & F12 to F18, G14 to G16  See map 2	Amesbury TC (322)	Noted.
See attached plan	H12 to H16 and I14  See map 2	Amesbury TC (323)	Noted.

## Bulford

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include :-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The existing MOD Canadian Estate, together with the proposed new Married Quarter estate under Army Re-basing (as approved by the Strategic Planning Committee)</b></li> </ul>	See map 3	Bulford PC (195)	Accept. Include within settlement boundary
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include :-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The significant and grouped developments consisting of "The Dovecot" and "Watergate House" that lie further to the West along Watergate Lane; this would allow for some "Infill" along Watergate Lane between the existing dwellings.</b></li> </ul>	See map 3	Bulford PC (195)	Reject. Residential development is not physically related (i.e. separate) from the settlement.
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include :-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The very significant development consisting of Bulford Manor, Manor farm and a number of residential</b></li> </ul>	See map 3	Bulford PC (195)	Accept in part. Residential development that is physically related to the settlement to be included within the settlement boundary.

<p>houses in the same small area, together with the two substantial residential houses to the north at the north end of Church Lane; this would allow for possible "Infill" along the west side of Church Lane in the years to come (the area to the east of Church Lane is an agricultural tenancy).</p>			
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include :-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The four grouped houses (Old Vicarage, Amiens, Mons, Arras Houses - the last three being MOD Married Quarters) and the quite heavy development lying on the east side of the Milston Road; this would permit very suitable "Infill" along the east side of the Milston Road (should the opportunity arise) particularly if the boundary is extended to the natural line of the east-west farm track further to the north. Whilst the four houses mentioned above have comparatively large gardens, it is considered that, as a group they constitute substantial development which can not be logically excluded, whilst development of the gardens would not be permitted for a variety of good</b></li> </ul>	<p>See map 3</p>	<p>Bulford PC (195)</p>	<p>Accept in part. Residential development that is physically related to the settlement to be included within the settlement boundary.</p>

planning Material Considerations.			
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include</b> :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The area lying to the north of The Bulford Drove way (between Vicarage Corner and the Pumping Station which would form an extension of the building line already formed by the four houses named in sub-para d. above; this area would be entirely suitable for development, should the opportunity arise. It should be noted that the area lying to the south of his stretch of road consists of a Water Meadow and a Parish Recreation Ground (and a stretch of the Nine Mile River itself).</b></li> </ul>	See map 3	Bulford PC (195)	Accept in part. Residential development that is physically related to the settlement to be included within the settlement boundary.
<p><b>Council proposes that the Boundary be extended to include</b> :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In addition to the above, Council is of the view that it would be entirely logical to draw the boundary so as to permit development by extending the building line along the west side of the road opposite the Rose &amp; Crown Public House, the Working Men's Club and the Avondale School.</b></li> </ul>	See map 3	Bulford PC (195)	Reject. The settlement boundary follows but not includes clearly defined physical features, such as roads

--	--	--	--

### Durrington

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The area that has now been included which encompasses Avon Valley College and their playing field and the Swimming Pool, which borders the rear of properties in Bulford Road and the Ham is of great concern. We wish to safeguard this area especially the open playing field which has in the past been unsuccessful in a SLAA application for housing because it was used as a playing field and sited outside the building line.</b>	(Durrington map) J & K 4	Durrington TC (93)	Reject. Built community facilities should be included within the settlement boundary. Only recreational and amenity space on the edge of settlements should be excluded from the boundary, therefore this playing field should be included.
<b>I am disappointed that the new boundary didn't include all of my neighbours garden, I have outlined the part of their garden not included.</b>	K3 - See map 4	Paul Jarrett	Accept in part. Include area of development and curtilage that relates to the settlement but exclude area that more closely relates to the countryside.

### Bradford on Avon

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
-------------------	----------------------	-------------	------------------

<p><b>This verge includes hedgerow and trees that have a strong relationship to the countryside beyond.</b></p> <p><b>Agree to change</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – A</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>These two dwellings, one historic and one contemporary, sit within an isolated piece of land that is surrounded on all sides by open countryside. In public views from the road and from the nearby PROW they appear as houses in a rural setting. They are clearly outside the fabric of the town.</b></p> <p><b>Disagree to inclusion of two dwellings as being within the settlement boundary.</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: EXCLUDE these two dwellings from the settlement boundary as shown on the attached plan.</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – B</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Reject. These two developments are closely related to the built environment so should be included within the boundary.</p>
<p><b>All other orchards and allotments on the boundary of Bradford on Avon are excluded from the settlement boundary and a consistent approach needs to be taken here.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed change leaves two cottages within open</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – C</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Accept. However, residential development which is closely related to the built form of the settlement has commenced in this area and should therefore be included within the boundary.</p>

<p><b>countryside, but this is correct as they are separated from the built form of Woolley by allotments and orchards, and their gardens also provide continuity of habitat through the presence of mature and characteristic fruit trees.</b></p> <p><b>Agree to the exclusion of orchards in open countryside, BUT do not agree with the proposed boundary as this excludes an adjacent area of Traditional Orchard NERC priority and an area of allotments that have a strong relationship to adjacent allotments that are excluded from the settlement boundary and to the countryside.</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: EXCLUDE the Traditional Orchard and adjacent allotments from the settlement boundary, as shown on the attached plan.</b></p>			
<p><b>Includes the verge and associated vegetation that relate to open countryside.</b></p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – D</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>This land is outside the historic boundary of the settlement at Woolley and</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – E</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>visually relates strongly to the adjacent open countryside.</p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>			
<p>These small fields/orchards are a characteristic feature of the locality and form a continuation of the rural landscape.</p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	See map 5 – F	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.
<p>The settlement boundary is right to include the bungalows, but it should <b>INCLUDE</b> the commercial part of this site – being a rank of garages formerly used as the base for milk floats.</p> <p><b>Agree but with modification:</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: EXTEND</b> the settlement boundary to include the garages and hard standing – as shown on the attached plan.</p>	See map 5 – G	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Accept. Amend boundary to include garages physically related to built environment.
<p>This is a continuation of an open field.</p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	See map 5 – H	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.
<p>This land is bounded by a road and modern housing and a driveway and is not related either functionally or</p>	See map 5 – I	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Accept.

<p>visually to the countryside.</p> <p><b>Disagree</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: EXTEND the settlement boundary to follow a simple alignment around the whole of this housing development (and not cut in westwards) and then cross the Holt Road to join the proposed boundary around the Kingston Farm site. Please see the attached plan.</b></p>			
<p><b>This is the open area adjacent to the Kingston Farm site that is subject to a proposed planning permission. It forms an integral part of the rural river valley landscape.</b></p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	See map 5 – J	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted. However, the methodology states that planning permissions should not be included within the boundary so exclude this area.
<p><b>This area comprises woodland that relates to and is continuation of the rural river valley landscape and defines the margin of the landscape setting to The Hall.</b></p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	See map 5 – K	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	The woodland area relates more closely to the open countryside and should be excluded from the boundary.
<p><b>This forms part of the river valley landscape.</b></p> <p><b>Agree</b></p>	See map 5 – L	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.
<p><b>Proposal: EXTEND the</b></p>	See map 5 – M&N	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Accept. Include the residential gardens within the boundary.

<p>settlement boundary to run along its original line – along the garden boundaries (and not cut gardens in half). Please see attached plan.</p>			
<p>The open space alongside the canal and defining the edge of Southway Park is an open amenity area that is visually and functionally outside the settlement and therefore relates more as a continuation of the countryside.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>See map 5 – O</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>This is an area of open and seemingly unused land that is fairly well treed.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>See map 5 – P</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>This land is bounded by a stone wall and housing and is a domestic garden. It does not functionally or visually relate to the countryside. It appears arbitrary to exclude this from the settlement boundary but include the adjacent house.</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Proposal: EXTEND the proposed settlement boundary to its original line –</p>	<p>See map 5 – Q</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Accept. Revert to original boundary.</p>

<p>to run along Jones' Hill and exclude the domestic garden.</p>			
<p><b>The principle of excluding the canal and river and its bankside vegetation should be consistently applied in Bradford on Avon. Currently the boundary is proposed to be amended to exclude the canal and its bankside vegetation but not the river.</b></p> <p><b>Agree</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: EXCLUDE the river and bankside vegetation from the settlement boundary to the east and west of the town centre, as shown on the attached plan at X and Y.</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – R, X, Y</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Agree. Exclude area of river and verges as they relate more closely to the countryside and in the interest of consistency.</p>
<p><b>This open field, parkland and large garden forms a visually important and continuous part of the river valley landscape and should therefore be excluded from the settlement boundary. Development in this large garden would extend the built form of the settlement and should therefore be excluded.</b></p> <p><b>Agree with modification.</b></p> <p><b>Proposal: The large residential garden along the river bank in front of</b></p>	<p>See map 5 – S</p>	<p>Bradford on Avon TC (214)</p>	<p>Accept. Exclude this area from the settlement boundary as it relates more closely to the open countryside and has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.</p>

<b>Kingston Lodge should be EXCLUDED from the settlement boundary</b>			
<b>The EXCLUSION of part of the landscaped grounds Belcombe Court was an anomaly, which the redrawing of the settlement boundary will rectify. We agree that the entire Belcombe Court landscape should be outside the settlement boundary.</b>  <b>Agree</b>	See map 5 – T	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.
<b>We presume that this land forms part of the Belcombe Court Grounds and it is therefore correct to EXCLUDE it from the settlement boundary.</b>  <b>Agree</b>	See map 5 – U	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted. However, methodology states that these residential gardens should be included within the boundary.
<b>The playing field to the west of the Music Centre forms a continuation of the amenity and rural landscape beyond.</b>  <b>Agree</b>	See map 5 – V	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.
<b>This area of land includes some hedgerow and trees that have a strong relationship to the countryside beyond.</b>  <b>Agree</b>	See map 5 – W	Bradford on Avon TC (214)	Noted.

--	--	--	--

## Calne

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>The documentation states that the draft boundaries are intended to include land subject of planning permissions.</p> <p>As such I would draw your attention to the exclusion of the land at Quemerford Calne. The land in question is subject to a resolution to grant outline planning permission (under delegated powers) subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement and details of that proposal can be found under application reference 13/04855/OUT.</p>	J13 &14	RCC Town Planning (38)	Reject. Methodology states that no planning permissions or allocations are to be included within the boundary.
<p>There appears to be an error in the map showing the Calne Draft Settlement Boundary. The blue line of the existing boundary currently includes the properties of The Knowle, Stockley Lane SN11 0SE. This is incorrect. These properties are outside the settlement boundary and are in Calne Without Parish?</p>	G15	Calne Without (88)	Reject. This area is physically related to the built up area of Calne. The settlement boundaries are separate to parish boundaries.
<p>It was suggested and agreed by Members to recommend that the</p>	H2/ H3	Calne TC (94)	Accept. Amend boundary to exclude land East of the road.

<p>area of land in H2/ H3 is brought back in line with the bypass to ensure that the land on the northern side of the bypass adjacent to the A3102 remains outside and not within the town boundary.</p>			
<p><b>As owner residents of The Croft, Stockley Lane, Calne, we have been studying your DPD “Draft Proposals for Revised Settlement Boundaries”.</b></p> <p><b>We are concerned that the map, showing the proposed revision to settlement boundary completely bisects our garden and property. The house is marked to be within the proposed revised settlement boundary, whereas the driveway and majority of our garden appears to lie outside of the possible revised boundary.</b></p> <p><b>Why isn't Quemerford House treated in the same way because it shows that the garden <u>and</u> the house are all outside the proposed settlement boundary?</b></p>	<p>G14?</p>	<p>Paul Morrison (208)</p>	<p>Accept in part. Draw boundary to include driveway but exclude area of garden more closely related to the open countryside. This methodology will also be applied to Quemerford House, where some garden may be within the boundary and some garden may be outside the boundary. Areas more closely related to the open countryside will be excluded from the boundary.</p>
<p><b>I have had sight of a plan which incorrectly delineates my property (Willows, Stockley Lane) as already being within the ‘Calne Town Settlement Area’ and so I would appreciate it if you could correct this anomaly at the soonest until the necessary discussions have been incepted, completed and the boundary</b></p>	<p>G15</p>	<p>Alan Evans (210)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary defines the built up area of Calne of which Stockley Lane forms part of. Parish boundaries are separate and are being reviewed separately as part of the Community Governance Review.</p>

position democratically agreed.			
<p>I have seen the draft proposals which show our property in The Knowle, Stockley Lane, Calne SN11 0SE as being already within the settlement boundary. This is totally incorrect as properties in The Knowle are and have always been part of Calne Without Parish.</p> <p>I would ask that this error be amended accordingly. Furthermore, I see absolutely no reasons why this should be changed and emphatically request that our property remains part of the Calne Without Parish.</p>	G15	A & MH Shannon (219)	The settlement boundary defines the built up area of Calne of which Stockley Lane forms part of. Parish boundaries are separate and are being reviewed separately as part of the Community Governance Review.
<p>It is also noted that The Atwell Wilson Motor Museum has now been transferred to be within the Settlement Boundary but the new boundary seems that it follows no property boundary but cuts across their land following no particular feature or boundary. Is this done to discourage any possible future development of the museum.</p>	G15	A & MH Shannon (229)	Museum to be included as it is physically related to the built settlement. Boundary follows defined features surrounding the museum.
<p><b>2 The Knowle, Stockley Lane, Calne, SN11 0se</b></p> <p>I am a resident at the above address within the parish of Calne Without. It has come to my attention that Wiltshire Council is proposing a revision to the</p>	G15	Drena Frankham (236) Ian Frankham (237)	The settlement boundary defines the built up area of Calne of which Stockley Lane forms part of. Parish boundaries are separate and are being reviewed separately as part of the Community Governance Review.

<p>settlement boundary of the The Knowle and The Willows. Your proposal shows that The Knowle and The Willows are already within the Calne Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>This is incorrect. I have lived in The Knowle since December 1995 and we have always been outside the Calne Settlement Boundary. The Knowle is surrounded on 3 sides by open fields. Indeed part of our property is a large garden meadow which is outside the incorrect existing boundary, and outside the proposal revision. The correct existing boundary is the southern boundary of 42 Stockley Lane running approximately NW to SE.</p> <p>Please note that I wish most strongly that our property remains rural and remains within the parish of Calne Without.</p>			
---	--	--	--

**Corsham**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>We have outlined the proposed area for inclusion in red within the red oval relating to the full map location.</b></p>	<p>Halfway Firs, Corsham, Wiltshire. SN13 0PJ</p> <p>See maps 6 &amp; 7</p>	<p>Peter Arnall (69, 70, 71,72)</p>	<p>Accept. Include within boundary.</p>

<b>The two houses closest to Academy Drive should be included within the settlement boundary which should then follow the A4</b> <b>The two houses are more closely related to the settlement</b>	F6	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (132)	Accept. Include within boundary.
<b>Follow A4</b> <b>More defined boundary, properties North of A4 are more closely related to the countryside</b>	G/H/I 4/5/6	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (133)	Accept. Follow A4 but include properties north of A4 grid reference F6, G5, G6.
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary</b> <b>More defined boundary, properties East of Pound Pill are more closely related to the countryside</b>	I 4/5/6/7/8/9	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (134)	Reject.
<b>Follow edge of back garden line.</b> <b>The gardens here are no larger than others which have not been excluded</b>	K 10	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (135)	Accept.
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary</b> <b>More defined boundary, properties the other side of the road are more closely related to the countryside.</b>	L 10	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (136)	Reject.
<b>Follow back garden line.</b> <b>The gardens here are no larger than others which have not been excluded</b>	J 11/12, K11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (137)	Accept.
<b>Follow road until you meet the back gardens of Dicketts Road</b>	J11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Accept

<b>and then follow this line No sense in excluding highway verge.</b>		Group (138)	
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary Formal play areas should be included.</b>	I11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (139)	Reject.
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary No sense in excluding highway verge.</b>	I H 11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (139)	Accept
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary</b>	G 10/11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (140)	Accept
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary Potley application no 14/05686/OUT</b>	F/G 11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (141)	Reject
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary</b>	F 11	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (142)	Reject
<b>Follow road to exclude Potley Fishing Lakes Informal open space more closely related to the countryside</b>	E/F/G 10	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (143)	Accept
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary</b>	D9	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (144)	Reject
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary</b>	B/C 8	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering	Accept

Quarry more related to the countryside		Group (145)	
<b>Follow A4</b> Copenacre site should be excluded as ex military sites are treated differently by the Core Strategy; highway verges should be included; properties north of the A4 should be excluded as more closely related to the countryside.	B/C/D 7	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (146)	Reject
<b>The criteria do not always seem to be followed, e.g. in the criteria to be included are 'existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement' but St Bartholomews Church (map ref IJ7) has been excluded which does not follow the criteria.</b>	IJ7	Rudloe/ Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131)	Accept. Include St Bartholomews Church within the settlement boundary.

### Devizes

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Office Comments
<b>Allocated employment site on the Horton Road to be removed.</b>	O 3 & 4	Devizes TC (300)	Devizes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is considered to review its settlement boundary. The Devizes Neighbourhood Plan had the intention of including its site

			allocations within its settlement boundary however one allocation was omitted in error. Wiltshire Council have not conducted a wholesale review of the settlement boundary of Devizes however it does include the site omitted from the boundary in error in the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>To the south of the town an importance piece of recreational land adjacent Drews Pond Wood remains within the Settlement Framework Boundary, although it clearly meets this criterion as recreational space to be removed.</b>	J11	Devizes TC (300)	Devizes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is considered to review its settlement boundary. The Devizes Neighbourhood Plan had the intention of including its site allocations within its settlement boundary however one allocation was omitted in error. Wiltshire Council have not conducted a wholesale review of the settlement boundary of Devizes however it does include the site omitted from the boundary in error in the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>Recreational land to the south of Thomas Wyatt Road is excluded to meet Wiltshire Councils criterion for amenity spaces.</b>	See map 8 J11	Devizes TC (300)	Devizes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is considered to review its settlement boundary. The Devizes Neighbourhood Plan had the intention of including its site allocations within its settlement boundary however one allocation was omitted in error. Wiltshire Council have not conducted a wholesale review of the settlement boundary of Devizes however it does include the site omitted from the boundary in error in the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>Settlement framework Boundary north of Horton Road should be changed.</b>	See map 9 O 3 & 4	Devizes TC (300)	Devizes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is considered to review its settlement boundary. The Devizes Neighbourhood Plan had the intention of including its site allocations within its settlement boundary however one allocation was omitted in error. Wiltshire Council have not conducted a wholesale review of the settlement boundary of Devizes however it does include the site omitted from the boundary in error in the Neighbourhood Plan.
<b>The Neighbourhoof Plan Steering</b>	See map 10	Devizes TC (300)	Devizes has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is

<p><b>Group is proposing as part of its amendments to the Settlement Framework Boundary that land within a 1600m radius of the town centre should include. This will allow for some suitable sites to come forward.</b></p>			<p>considered to review its settlement boundary. The Devizes Neighbourhood Plan had the intention of including its site allocations within its settlement boundary however one allocation was omitted in error. Wiltshire Council have not conducted a wholesale review of the settlement boundary of Devizes however it does include the site omitted from the boundary in error in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
---	--	--	--

### Ludgershall

No representations

### Malmesbury

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Office Comments
<p><b>On 10 th July the High Court de facto granted outline planning permission to Gleeson Stratetic Land's application N/11/04126/OUT "Land South of Filands". The settlement boundary needs to accommodate this land.</b></p>	4 F G H	Malmesbury TC (83)	Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary unless the development has commenced.
<p><b>The settlement boundary needs to accommodate the Dyson employment land identified in application N/14/02971/OUT for which outline planning permission was granted 9 th June 2014.</b></p>	3 & 4 C & D	Malmesbury TC (83)	Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary unless the development has commenced.
<p><b>The settlement boundary does not</b></p>	11 H	Malmesbury TC (83)	Reject. Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to

accommodate "Site 10" - a site which is being progressed through the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan. See this map from the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	See map 11	St Paul Malmesbury Without (106)	be included within the settlement boundary.
In accordance with the "exclude gardens" criterion, the boundary bifurcates High Street gardens in cell 10 G. Why does the the boundary not do the same in cell 9 F for The Maltings?	9 F	Malmesbury TC (83)	Accept. Include curtilages of properties that related more to the built form of the settlement.

### Marlborough

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
It was encouraging that the boundary line had been reduced and that the Town Council welcomed this revised boundary.		Marlborough TC (272)	Noted.

### Melksham & Bowerhill

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
The Council feel this should remain OUTSIDE of the Settlement Boundary as it did in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 1 st Alteration 2004. As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling	H11, I11 & I12: The Spa	Melksham Without (61, 62)	Accept in part. This area is physically related to the built form of the settlement so should be included within the boundary. However, include properties and their curtilages which are more closely related to the settlement.

<p>inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.</p>			
<p><b>The Council feel that Berryfield should not be considered as a small village and be included in this Settlement Boundary Review. Berryfield is bigger than North Bradley for example, which is being considered under this review. There is a lot of development planned for Berryfield with the Melksham Link canal project and associated development, as well as a current planning application for 170 dwellings (W/14/07526).</b></p>	<p>B13, C13, D11, D12, D13, D14, E11, E12: Berryfield</p>	<p>Melksham Without (61, 63)</p>	<p>Reject. The Core Strategy identifies Berryfield as a small village. Small villages do not have settlement boundaries.</p>
<p><b>The boundary used to follow a clear physical feature here, the A350, but there is a now a 'finger' drawn encompassing the Mobile Home Park, this does not follow a clear physical feature.</b></p>	<p>D11, E11, E11,E12: Mobile Home Park, Berryfield</p>	<p>Melksham Without (61, 64)</p>	<p>Accept. Revert to original boundary removing the Mobile Home Park.</p>
<p><b>The boundary has been moved to NOT include this site which now has outlying planning consent and an application for demolition; why would the boundary move now to not include a site that has planning consent?</b></p>	<p>3B: Shurnhold offices/George Ward school site</p>	<p>Melksham Without (61, 65)</p>	<p>Accept, implementation of this planning permission has commenced on the site and therefore it should be included within the boundary.</p>
<p><b>The Parish Council do not understand why the Melksham Treatment Works has not been included within the settlement</b></p>	<p>7C: Sewage sites</p>	<p>Melksham Without (61, 66)</p>	<p>Accept. Include treatment works in the settlement boundary.</p>

boundary of the Town when the adjacent Countrywide and Asda sites are included. The Sewage Works could not be considered as undeveloped countryside.			
As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.	B3 & C3: Dunch Lane & G6	Melksham Without (61, 67)	Accept. Revert to original boundary including the curtilages of the properties.
The Council has concerns that the Village of Bowerhill does not have a delineation between the Industrial and Residential areas.	D 13, 14, 15, 16 – K13, 14, 15, 16: Bowerhill Industrial and Residential areas	Melksham Without (61, 68)	The methodology states that all residential and employment development physically related to the settlement should be included within the boundary. The boundary does not affect Core Strategy employment area designations.

### Royal Wootton Bassett

No representations

### Tidworth

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
At the moment Tidworth includes the area of Perham Down which has not been included within this boundary assessment on the grounds that Perham Down is a settlement in its own right.  This will mean that this area is not being considered by a responsible		Tidworth TC (193)	Reject. Perham Down is isolated from the main Tidworth settlement and therefore should not be included within the boundary.

<p><b>council authority and therefore not correctly assessed. For all future assessments Perham Down &amp; Tidworth should be considered as a single boundary entity as it falls within a single Town Council responsibility.</b></p>			
---	--	--	--

### Warminster

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>Reinstate the buffer zone in the WUE between A36 and proposed 900 houses to north of Swaledale Road. Needed for environmental, noise reduction, natural beauty and other reasons.</b></p>	East Warminster	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276)</p>	Noted. To be dealt with through the Urban Extension Plans.
<p><b>Approve Grovelands SHLAA site 1007 as being outside the settlement boundary. Church Street SHLAA be moved outside the settlement boundary.</b></p>	H4 & 5	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	Accept.
<p><b>Move the employment land on the WUE to the east of Bath Road (SHLAA site 1034) and retain the WUE allocation for leisure. Consider bringing the former Lyons Seafood and Dents sites in</b></p>	G&H4??	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276)</p>	Noted. To be dealt with through the Urban Extension Plans.

<p><b>to the settlement boundary to ease the burden to both west and east wards of the proposed additional 1920 (by 2026) dwellings.</b></p>		<p>N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	
<p><b>Bore Hill SHLAA site 1032 should be within the settlement boundary, it should not be retained as employment land only.</b></p>	<p>G11</p>	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	<p>Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Approve Smallbrook Meadows, St George's playing fields and YeatesMeadow as being outside the settlement boundary.</b></p>		<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Request Tynings Allotments to be placed outside the settlement boundary, and made into statutory allotments.</b></p>	<p>G9 &amp; 10</p>	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	<p>Accept. Move allotments outside of the boundary.</p>
<p><b>Include SHLAA site 304, Boreham Mead, in the settlement boundary. It is within the parish boundary and planning permission has been given for this development.</b></p>	<p>O 9 &amp; 10</p>	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273, 274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	<p>Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be included within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Include SHLAA sites 603, 2073,</b></p>	<p>(SHLAA layer on map)</p>	<p>Jim &amp; Sandra George (273,</p>	<p>Permissions, allocations and SHLAA sites are not to be</p>

<p><b>2074 and 2075 on the east within the settlement boundary to achieve balanced development.</b></p>		<p>274) Lee Van Kassel and Stephanie Carrol (275) Roger Walton Jean Walton Hazel Cross (276) N&amp;SC Dowling (297)</p>	<p>included within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Modifications to the boundary are proposed. The green boundary drawn on the plan is accepted as the new settlement boundary but to include a buffer zone on the West urban extension and exclude the Tynings Allotments at Bradley Road and the Town Park and all its land including Warminster Town Football Club.</b></p>	<p>G9 and 10 (allotments), J7 and 8 (town park)</p>		<p>Noted. To be dealt with through the Urban Extension Plans. Move the allotments outside of the boundary line.</p>

**Westbury**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>This area does not fall within your criterion.</b></p>	<p>D5 and E5</p>	<p>Heywood PC (159)</p>	<p>Reject. Built employment development is included within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Heywood Parish Council objects to all proposed extensions save the additional dwelling in D6.</b></p>	<p>D6</p>	<p>Heywood PC (159)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>The 3 categories of extension that Heywood Parish Council does not agree with are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including employment allocations e.g. West Wilts Trading Estate and the</li> </ul>	<p>?, D5 and E5, Lodgewood Farm (D3,E3)</p>	<p>Heywood PC (159)</p>	<p>Reject. Built employment development is included within the settlement boundary.</p>

<p>proposed Hawke Ridge Business Park within settlement boundaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modification D5 and E5 as stated previously.</li> <li>• Inclusion of Lodgewood Farm (D3,E3) as it is an isolated farm in open countryside.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>You have not followed your own criteria at:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Map Grid Reference: G7-</b> The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.</li> </ul> <p>There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.</p>	G7	Westbury TC (167)	Accept, although all unimplemented planning permissions and allocations are now excluded from the settlement boundary.
<p><b>You have not followed your own criteria at:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension</b></li> </ul> <p>An isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</p> <p>We wish the premises known as Courtleigh to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.</p>	F14/ F15	Westbury TC (167, 181)	Reject. This area is physically related to the built form of the settlement.

<p><b>You have not followed your own criteria at:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>An isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</b></p> <p><b>We wish the house that has been added south of Wellhead Drive (Fourways) to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 2.</b></p>	<p>H15</p>	<p>Westbury TC (167, 180)</p>	<p>Accept. Exclude from settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>You have not followed your own criteria at:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension</b></li> </ul> <p><b>An isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.</b></p> <p><b>We wish the extension to the settlement boundary at Chalford Gardens to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.</b></p>	<p>H14</p>	<p>Westbury TC (167, 179)</p>	<p>Reject. Built residential development physically related to the built form of the settlement.</p>
<p><b>Hawkeridge Business Park allocation area.</b></p> <p><b>We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</b></p>	<p>F3</p>	<p>Westbury TC (167)</p>	<p>Accept, but due to revised methodology excluded all unimplemented planning permissions.</p>

<b>West Wilts Trading Estate.</b>  This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.	C4/ D4	Westbury TC (168)	Reject. Built employment development is now included within the settlement boundary. Other policies address change of use.
<b>This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.</b>	C6/ C7 etc.	Westbury TC (169)	Reject. Built employment development is now included within the settlement boundary. Other policies address change of use.
<b>Northacre Park allocation area:</b>  We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.	C8	Westbury TC (170)	Accept, but due to revised methodology excluded all unimplemented planning permissions.
<b>We wish the blue line running along Storridge Road retained with the housing limit solely around this residential area.</b>	E6/ E7	Westbury TC (171)	Accept in part. Revert to original boundary.
<b>We do not wish allocation sites to be included in the settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</b>	E9/ D10	Westbury TC (172)	Accept. Allocation sites are now excluded from the settlement boundary.
<b>We agree that the five houses on Station Road opposite the Railway</b>	F8	Westbury TC (173)	Noted.

<b>Inn should be brought within the settlement boundary.</b>			
<b>We consider that the area of open space within the triangle of railway lines should be excluded in accordance with your criterion.</b>	G6	Westbury TC (174)	Accept. Exclude from settlement boundary
<b>We consider that the fishing lake south west of Frogmore Lane and all the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and all the land north east of Frogmore Lane should be excluded from the settlement boundary because there are no extant planning permissions on these pieces of land and they are contrary to your criteria.</b>	G7	Westbury TC (175)	Accept. All unimplemented planning permissions and allocations are now excluded from the settlement boundary.
<b>We agree that all the residential development under construction north west of Slag Lane (but not the Network Rail signalling building) should be brought within the settlement boundary.</b>	F7	Westbury TC (176)	Noted
<b>The allocation site adjacent to Westbury Hospital does not have planning permission. It should be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</b>	I12/ J12	Westbury TC (177)	Accept. All unimplemented planning permissions and allocations are now excluded from the settlement boundary.
<b>Leighton Sports Centre should be entirely excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 1.</b>	I13	Westbury TC (178)	Reject. Built community facilities development is included within the settlement boundary.
<b>Westbury Leigh Primary School</b>	D13/ D14	Westbury TC (182)	Reject. Built community facilities development is included

should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.			within the settlement boundary.
<b>The White Horse Health Centre should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</b>	D13	Westbury TC (183)	Reject. Built community facilities development is included within the settlement boundary.
<p>I attach two plans on one pdf. One is the land registry plan showing their boundary. On it I have hatched that part of the site which is included in the settlement boundary as shown on the other plan, which I have arrowed.</p> <p>It would appear logical that the boundary line be moved to include the whole of their site which is currently the garden.</p>	F14, F15 See map 12	Robert Quartley (350)	Accept. Include garden physically related to the settlement within the boundary.

## Local Service Centres

### Cricklade

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The proposed boundary change carves off a corner of our garden unnecessarily. We use this triangle of land as our garden and wish to continue to do so with all the benefits that arise. Indeed our barn has been placed to isolate this triangle as garden land.</b>	G9	Julie Norman (92)	Accept. This area relates more closely to the built form of the settlement so should be included within the boundary.
<b>This boundary is not acceptable and appears to breach criterion 4.</b>	J4	Cricklade TC (108)	Reject. Curtilages of properties that relate more closely to the built form should be included within the boundary.
<b>This boundary is not acceptable as it appears to breach criterion 4. The gardens are relatively large compared with adjacent development.</b>	K6	Cricklade TC (109)	Reject. Built development and curtilages of properties that relate more closely to the built form should be included within the boundary.
<b>Cricklade Town Council is of the view that the Chelworth Industrial Areas have become sufficiently sizeable to now be included in the Cricklade Settlement Boundary Review.</b>	A12 and B12 and beyond	Cricklade TC (110)	Reject. This area is isolated from the built form of the settlement.
<b>There appears to be a minor drafting error and the green line enclosing the "box shaped" garage section should be deleted - the garage, which has permission for conversion to a dwelling, is part of the settlement area.</b>	G9	Cricklade TC (111)	Permissions are to be excluded from the boundary, however this area relates more closely to the built form of the settlement so should be included within the boundary.

<p>The area of land proposed is found on your map 100049050, 2014 – Grid Reference: G9. Please find attached, our own site plan on the Land Registry document: WT313206 for your consideration.</p> <p>The area that we are asking to be considered for inclusion within a revised boundary and building line is coloured – Blue on that plan.</p>	<p>G9 See map 13</p>	<p>Vincent Mobey (115)</p>	<p>Accept. The area coloured blue on the plan is more closely related to the built environment than to the open countryside. Include within the settlement boundary.</p>
--	--------------------------	----------------------------	--

**Downton**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>Downton Parish Council has no objection to the proposed revision of the Settlement Boundary as set out in the draft plan for Downton.</p>		<p>Downton Parish Council</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Market Lavington**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The draft Proposed Settlement Boundary for Market Lavington contains within the defined settlement area the open wooded space known as Canada Wood (Reference G6, H6 and H5 on the MAP 100049050,20140) This wooded area is a valuable open village space and should be outside the Settlement Boundary.</b>	G6, H6 and H5	Market Lavington PC (211)	Accept. Amend boundary to exclude area more closely related to the countryside.

### Mere

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>Ivymead Fish Farm - as this is an employment site/brownfield site, members felt that it should be encompassed within the HSB in order to be in accordance with the criterion and to have a consistent approach.</b>	K6 & L6 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (313)	Accept. To be included within boundary.
<b>Mere School - There was a debate about whether or not Mere School should be within the new Housing Settlement Boundary but it was agreed that the new Boundary, encompassing the built environment of Mere School was in accordance with the criterion.</b>	K5 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (313)	Noted.
<b>Mill Lane - It was confirmed that</b>	K7, K8 & L7	Mere PC (313)	Noted.

<p>historically Mill Lane was outside the Housing Policy Boundary because the lane was considered too narrow to accommodate any further development. However, even though members felt that it would be inappropriate to allow further development along Mill Lane, they felt that the new boundary was consistent with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</p>	<p>See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>		
<p>Shaftesbury Road - Members felt that the new Housing Settlement Boundary met with the criterion applied.</p>	<p>M10, M11 &amp; M12 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (313)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Woodlands Road - Members noted that both the Brush Factory site and the old Beaumonts site were now within the new Housing Settlement Boundary and although the Brush Factory site is being considered as a brownfield site for development (current planning application 14/06780/OUT), the Beaumonts site has not been considered. However, it is a built environment for employment use and is therefore in accordance with the criterion for the Housing Settlement Boundary.</p>	<p>K9 &amp; K10 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (313)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Land behind Michaelmas House &amp; Breezeland, Pettridge Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been</p>	<p>J7 &amp; J8 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (313)</p>	<p>Noted. However, the revised settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden).</p>

<b>applied in accordance with the criterion.</b>			
<b>St Michael's Church - It was agreed that the new housing settlement boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</b>	H6 & H7 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (313)	Noted. However, the revised settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Castle Hill Lane - It was agreed that the new Housing Settlement Boundary had been applied in accordance with the criterion.</b>	H5 & H6 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (313)	Noted. The revised settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Jack Paul Close Allotments - It was agreed that the allotment site should be taken out of the Housing Policy Boundary and the new Housing Settlement Boundary was agreed as this would be consistent with the approach taken at Southbrook Allotments and the criterion applied</b>	I3 & I4 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (313)	Noted.
<b>Southbrook – garden at Orchard House - Members felt that it was inconsistent to have this garden within the Housing Settlement Boundary when others have been taken out and members considered that this would be an inappropriate place for development since it is the site of the Southbrook pond and should therefore be taken out of the boundary.</b>	M8 See map 313 & 313a	Mere PC (314)	Accept. This is the curtilage of a property that relates more to the open countryside (e.g. a field or a paddock) than the built environment.
<b>Church Field, Angel Lane + The</b>	I7 & I7	Mere PC (315)	Accept. Include with the boundary.

<p><b>Vicarage - Members agreed that it was appropriate for this field to be outside the Housing Settlement Boundary. However, if The Chantry and Deans Orchard are within the Housing Settlement Boundary then The Vicarage should also be within the boundary for consistency.</b></p>	<p>See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>		
<p><b>Nursery sites at Townsend - As this was an employment site/ brownfield site and within the built environment for employment use, members felt that this site should be within the Housing Settlement Boundary for consistency purposes and to be in accordance with the criterion</b></p>	<p>G7, G8, F7 &amp; F8 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (316)</p>	<p>Accept. Include with the boundary</p>
<p><b>Employment land adjacent to Quarryfields Industrial Estate - The Clerk explained that she thought that the new Housing Settlement Boundary included the land allocated for B1 &amp; B2 industrial use (extant planning permission received in 2009 &amp; renewed in 2011) owned by TZZ Estates + the land for the proposed new brush factory site (planning application currently being considered), although the boundary line was not entirely consistent with the planning applications submitted.</b></p> <p><b>However, members felt that this line ought to be extended to allow</b></p>	<p>C6, B6 &amp; A6 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (317)</p>	<p>Reject. All unimplemented planning permissions and allocations are excluded from within the settlement boundary. However, the possibility of allocating part of this area could be explored through a neighbourhood plan.</p>

<p>for further employment allocations within the lifespan of the development plan. It was suggested that the line should be extended out to the A303 junction but also that the allocation should be protected in some way so as not to allow residential development.</p>			
<p><b>Land behind Castle Hill Crescent/Manor Road - Councillors agreed that the old Housing Boundary should be applied in this instance since it may allow an opportunity for Wiltshire Council to consider a very small low cost housing scheme in the future</b></p>	<p>H5 &amp; I5 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (318)</p>	<p>Accept. Include within boundary. Recreational/ amenity space that relates more to the built environment and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.</p>
<p><b>Land between Wellhead/Downside Close - Members felt that this was an obvious place for future development and, since the land was owned by the Duchy of Cornwall, could be an avenue to explore for some much needed low cost housing to meet local needs. Members felt that the Housing Settlement Boundary should extend to encompass this field so that controlled development could be an option within the life of the Development Plan.</b></p>	<p>I3, J3 &amp; J4 See map 313 &amp; 313a</p>	<p>Mere PC (319)</p>	<p>Reject. Conflicts with the methodology, which excludes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that primarily relates more to the open countryside and has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement. However, the possibility of allocating this area could be explored through a neighbourhood plan.</p>

## Pewsey

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
I strongly support the change to the boundary in the Ball Road area, bringing the boundary back to the line of the road and the existing dwellings and pub on the east side of the road. The current boundary that takes in part of the field appears to be an anomaly and it would be excellent if the opportunity to remedy this can be taken with the boundary review.	K7	Charmian Spickernell (304)	The settlement boundary for Pewsey was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. Pewsey has a made Neighbourhood Plan which is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.

## Tisbury

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
Why has the boundary excluded 'Applewell' which is clearly marked on the map.	F8	West Tisbury PC (198)	Accept. Amend boundary to include 'Applewell'.
Including the playing fields will cause consternation and sends a poor message.	G5	West Tisbury PC (199)	Accept. Exclude playing fields as amenity space and more closely related to the countryside.
Criterion related to the exclusion of recreational or amenity space is most unclear – if these areas are to be excluded, why have you included the future wildflower	G5	West Tisbury PC (209)	Accept. Exclude area as amenity space and more closely related to the countryside.

<p>meadow at G5? And the King George V playing fields which are protected?</p>			
<p><b>The inclusion of the King George V playing field; this is a charitable asset and as such cannot be used for development under the stated objectives.</b></p>	<p>G5</p>	<p>Tisbury PC (261)</p>	<p>Accept. Exclude playing fields as amenity space and more closely related to the countryside.</p>
<p><b>Our opposition to the draft revised tightening of the boundary to exclude the specific Gold Hill Gate site (reference I 3 -J 3) Plan 2. pages(2.1)-(2.5) This site has recently been granted planning permission for a new single dwelling in 2014 and a reapplication in February 2015. All other changes of the draft settlement boundaries are accepted.</b></p>	<p>SHLAA site -3365, ref: 10546 I3 to J3  See map 16</p>	<p>Barry Woodcock (338, 339)</p>	<p>Accept. Revert to original boundary to include curtilages of properties physically related to the settlement.</p>
<p><b>An application to seek your support to extend the village boundary to include the field to the North East of Tuckingfold as shown on attached sketch Plan 3 pages(3.1)-(3.5) . This field is part of the garden and lies within the curtilage of Tuckingfold.</b></p> <p><b>We seek Wiltshire Council's support to extend the village boundary to include the field to the North East of "Tuckingfold", currently within the Tuckingfold curtilage, as shown on the attached sketch plan <u>Plan 3</u> (hatched in red). And refer to our</b></p>	<p>SHLAA site -3365, ref: 10546  See map 17</p>	<p>Barry Woodcock (338, 340)</p>	<p>Reject, this area of land is more closely related to the open countryside. SHLAA sites and planning permissions are not to be included within the boundary.</p>

---

<p>previous pre-application enquiry of 20th February 2013.. your REF. PE/13/0037. And our response to your Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 23rd April 2014, REF. 10546 + SHLAA Site 3365.</p>			
--	--	--	--

**Wilton**

No representations

## Large Villages

### Aldbourne

Specific Comments	Grid reference	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>As a local councillor I have recently seen a suggested alteration to the village plan/boundary which: (i) Cuts my garden into 2 pieces using the old wall as part of the boundary and cutting my conservatory away from the terrace and main lawn; (ii) Cuts the paddock off with no reference to the fact that it is part of the property and the previous planning permission which I have recently applied to review as we have five the land to our children. (iii) We wish to retain the old house in its grounds and possibly use the paddock for housing. We think the placing of the paddock outside the village boundary does not follow previous decisions and does not follow accepted boundaries.</b></p>	H5	Richard Price (letter)	Reject. Exclude the paddock and rear of garden from the settlement boundary as it more closely relates to the open countryside and has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.

### Alderbury

Specific Comments	Grid reference	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>My detached house, Byways, occupies a half-acre plot fronting on to Southampton Road, Alderbury, SP5 3AF.</b></p> <p><b>From the relevant Plan, I see that you propose to remove the existing settlement boundary so as to extend the area in which I believe no development will be permitted, beyond my neighbour's virtually abandoned area at the rear of my property to include half of my property</b></p> <p><b>This is naturally of extreme concern to me and I find it incredible that this action, which potentially could be disadvantageous to, me has been taken not just without consultation but without even the courtesy of any prior advice of it.</b></p>	H5	Richard Wharton (114)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<p><b>Alderbury Parish Council are happy to accept the revised boundaries shown on the map, except they would like Mr. Richard Wharton's comments to be taken into account as referred to in section C.</b></p> <p><b>Please see letter for Mr. Richard Wharton (Comment ID 114), a resident regarding his thoughts on the proposed boundary change that relates to his garden shown in the centre of the grid reference.</b></p>	H5	Alderbury PC (250)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.

### Ashton Keynes

No representations

### Atworth

No representations

**Baydon**

No representations

**Box**

No representations

**Bratton**

No representations

**Broad Chalke**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>We agree the changes proposed <u>except</u> :</b></p> <p><b>We note that the area indicated by an arrow (&lt;---) on the attached map has been <u>proposed for removal</u> from the settlement boundary. This would remove two building plots (at least) in the centre of the village close to the village amenities (Shop, PO, Pub, Medical Centre, Church). Our neighbourhood plan envisages this as an ideal infill site for affordable or old peoples or marketable housing. We cannot see why it is proposed for removal (it is not on rural land, nor obscuring iconic views). We therefore request that this potential building land is <u>Retained Within The Settlement Boundary</u>.</b></p>	See map 18	Broad Chalke Parish Council (337)	Accept. These curtilages of properties are more closely related to the built area than to the countryside.

**Broad Hinton**

No representations

**Bromham**

No representations

**Burbage**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>I note that the draft boundaries are intended to include land subject of planning permissions and would draw your attention to the exclusion of the land subject of a resolution to grant planning permission at Burbage – Council Ref 13/06529/OUT</b>	I 10 & 11	Pegasus Planning Group (9)	Reject. Revised methodology states that planning permissions are to be excluded from the settlement boundary.
<b>Boundary should remain as it currently exists.</b>	K9	Paul J (10)	Accept. Built residential development and the curtilages of the properties that physically relate to the settlement.
<b>The plan excludes my Garden which was previously inside the settlement area. I can not see what possible benefit this has to the Parish or Town council.</b>  <b>The boundry to my garden should remain as it is. It is</b>	K 10	Myles Young (91)	Accept. Built residential development and the curtilages of the properties that physically relate to the settlement.

<b>just a family garden.</b>			
<b>Long gardens outside boundary but on west of H8 they are included – inconsistent</b>	K9/ H8	Burbage PC (221)	Accept. Revised methodology states that curtilages of properties will be excluded where they have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. Include gardens at K9 to follow methodology.
<b>Not clear why the expansion is necessary</b>	H6	Burbage PC (230)	Reject. Residential garden related to the built settlement with limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Not clear why the expansion is necessary</b>	K8	Burbage PC (231)	Reject. Methodology states that built development that relates to the settlement should be included in the boundary. Where possible the boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features.
<b>Revert to original / existing - no reason for expansion</b>	H8	Burbage PC (232)	Accept in part. Accept comment for south section of H8, however reject for north section. Amend boundary to follow clearly defined physical feature.
<b>Western Edge - revert to original boundary or redraw to include buildings but not long gardens/land. See - K9</b>	H4	Burbage PC (233)	Reject. Development and the curtilages of properties that have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement should be included in the boundary.
<b>Second from top -revert to original/existing. No reason for chane</b>	G3	Burbage PC (234)	Reject. Boundary extended to include development physically related to the settlement.
<b>Extend boundary to include area granted outline planning 13/03498/OUT</b>	11 i	Burbage PC (235)	Reject. Revised methodology states that planning permissions are to be excluded from the settlement boundary.

## Chapmanslade

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The boundary is extended north of the road to encourage sustainable development in the village.</b>	5F	Mark Maidment (5)	Reject. No justification for extending the settlement boundary to include a field on the other side of the road from existing development.
<b>A Planning proposal which includes application to the SHLAA database for assessment, under reference 3203 . Anticipated timescale would be Q4 2014/Q1 2015.</b>	F4 & 5	Mark Maidment (5)	Reject. The methodology excludes allocations.
<b>This practice acts for Aedifico Limited whichowns the Green Farm Industrial Estate and adjoining land (“the site”) in the village of Chapmanslade, West Wiltshire. The site lies outside but immediately adjacent to part of the settlement boundary of Chapmanslade which is identified as a ‘Large Village’ in the emerging Core Strategy.</b>  <b>With regard to the emerging Housing Site Allocations DPD, my client proposes (i) the allocation of the site for housing purposes, and (ii) the realignment of the settlement boundary of Chapmanslade to include the site.</b>	See map 19	C Wickham	Reject. The methodology excludes allocations.

A drawing, numbered AL(1)03A, is attached. This identifies the site in relation to the existing settlement boundary, and also shows the suggested alteration to the settlement boundary to include the site.			
--	--	--	--

### Christian Malford

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
Please confirm why the boundary is being extended for this area? It is difficult to be certain from the map but appears to be expanding the development area for the school.	H7	Christian Malford PC (39)	Methodology states that the boundary should include community facility development, including schools, that is physically related to the settlement.
Why has the boundary been contracted for this area?	H5	Christian Malford PC (40)	Draft methodology removed all large gardens; revised methodology removes large gardens with the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. Use original boundary as limited capacity to extend the built form of the development.

### Codford

Specific Comments	Grid reference	Respondents	Officer Comments
The proposed boundary splits the garden in two to exclude an	I 6.9	Codford Parish Council (41)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.

<p>existing garage/shed/office. It is suggested that the whole garden should be included in the settlement.</p>			
<p>In this case the proposed boundary change has extended the rear garden to convert it into what could be described as "a large garden". No change of boundary is recommended.</p>	<p>H 7.3</p>	<p>Codford Parish Council (41)</p>	<p>Accept. Revert to original boundary.</p>
<p>The proposed boundary change splits the farm yard and the existing agricultural buildings into two sites. One half on which there are two bungalows is included and the other excluded. It appears inconsistent that the entire site which is physically and functionally related to the settlement should be divided in two parts; one potentially available for development and the other not so. It is recommended that the site should be considered as one entity and as such it should be either included or excluded. The site in its entirety is contiguous to the village settlement and as such the Parish Council considers its</p>	<p>G/H 5.8</p>	<p>Codford Parish Council (74)</p>	<p>Revert to original boundary excluding the farm buildings.</p>

inclusion within the settlement boundary to be practical and more consistent to the implementation of the draft criterion.			
<b>The proposed boundary change in this case divides the large garden area of the property into two separate plots; one within the draft settlement boundary and the other without. The residual section nevertheless includes a garden of considerable dimensions available for potential development which is inconsistent with other smaller gardens within the settlement which are excluded when applying the draft criterion.</b>	G 5.5	Codford Parish Council (75)	Revert to original boundary.
<b>The proposed boundary should be extended to encompass the existing agricultural buildings which are contiguous to the village and are physically and functionally related to the settlement.</b>	F 6.1	Codford Parish Council (76)	Agricultural buildings should be excluded from the boundary in large villages. Methodology states that employment land at the edge of large villages should be excluded.
<b>The existing large garden area has been reduced considerably by the application of the draft</b>	G 6.5	Codford Parish Council (77)	Revert to original boundary. This encompasses residential gardens that relate more closely to the built form of the settlement.

<p>critterion but the resultant land within the proposed boundary, potentially available for development, can still nevetheless be defined as a large residential garden and as such it is inconsistent with the declared criteria for exclusion.</p>			
---	--	--	--

**Colerne**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>See attached maps for proposed boundaries.</p>	<p>See maps 20, 21 &amp; 22</p>	<p>Colerne PC (15, 191, 192)</p>	<p>Reject inclusion of Colerne Industrial park – employment development at the edge of large villages should be excluded from the boundary.</p> <p>Accept inclusion of residential development to the East of Colerne – residential development that is physically related to the settlement.</p> <p>Reject proposal to include isolated development and land more closely related to the countryside to the West of Colerne.</p> <p>Reject proposal to include isolated development to the South East of Colerne.</p> <p>Reject inclusion of North Colerne as this is an isolated area and separate from the main settlement.</p>

**Collingbourne Ducis**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>Half of my garden will be out of the boundary and it states that boundaries will follow existing hedges.</p> <p>Willowbrae – Do not move the existing boundary</p>	J5 and J6	Graham Dawkins (2)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<p>Sunton Meadow and Bourne Meadow should always sit outside any settlement boundaries as they are an integral and historic part of the character of the village.</p>	?		Accept.

### Coombe Bissett

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>You have included large gardens (marked in pink on the map enclosed).</p> <p>The parish Council do NOT support ANY changes to the CURRENT settlement boundary as they were only agreed 3 years ago in 2011.</p> <p>A parish plan was produced in 2012 after extensive consultation. Residents expressed preference</p>	See map 23	Coombe Bissett & Homington PC (95)	Accept in part. Accept the use existing boundary at the western point of Coombe Bissett to exclude isolated development and curtilage of property more closely related to the countryside and with the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. Other large gardens to be included within the settlement boundary where they have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. Residential development physically relating to the settlement will be included in the boundary.

<p>for NO new development.</p> <p>The Parish Council confirms that they do NOT support and [any] of the proposed draft settlement boundary.</p>			
---	--	--	--

**Corsley**

No representations

**Crudwell**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>Wellbrook Cottage, sited on the Eastern side of the A429. This property was extended in 1994, but the extension does not appear on the map. As a result, the new boundary includes the original cottage footprint, but not the extension.</b></p>	<p>I6?</p>	<p>Crudwell PC (280)</p>	<p>Accept. This is built residential development that is physically related to the settlement and includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement</p>
<p><b>My family live in the part of Crudwell that is currently excluded from the existing Settlement Boundary, but included within a Conservation Area. Under the proposed re-drawing of the Settlement Boundary, our property will still be outside of the Settlement Boundary. We would be one of</b></p>	<p>See map 280</p>	<p>Crudwell PC (280)</p>	<p>Accept. This is built residential development that is physically related to the settlement and includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement</p>

<p>only two properties East of the A429 and South of the Crudwell/Eastcourt road that is not included. Is there a specific reason for this exclusion?</p> <p>We would request the inclusion of our garden into the Settlement Boundary, as it is no bigger than some of the other properties being included and those buildings designated as ancillary residential. If the inclusion of a garden is a step to far, then we would request the Settlement Boundary be adjusted as shown (pink line) to include our property (and multiple property access driveway). The green line is your proposed new Settlement Boundary.</p>			
<p>The area i4 appears to have the modified boundary running through the middle of a number of large gardens with no discernable physical feature.</p>	I4	Crudwell PC (283, 289, 290)	Accept. This is the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<p>Reduce boundary - residential garden</p>	J5	Crudwell PC (283)	Reject. The settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<p>Reduce boundary - residential gardens</p>	I7	Crudwell PC (284)	Reject. The settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. However, these properties are isolated from the main settlement so should not be included within the boundary.

<b>Reduce boundary - commercial lorry park</b>	H8	Crudwell PC (285)	Accept. Employment development on the edge of large villages should be excluded from the boundary.
<b>Redraw boundary to include residential extension</b>	I6	Crudwell PC (286)	Accept. This is built residential development that is physically related to the settlement and includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Respondent owns one of these properties Redraw boundary to include 2 X residential properties related to the settlement</b>	I6	Crudwell PC (287)	Accept. This is built residential development that is physically related to the settlement and includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Reduce boundary - residential garden</b>	G9	Crudwell PC (288)	Reject. The settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.

### Dilton Marsh

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The new 'settlement line' is drawn through (and bisects) the gardens in a number of instances. For example, some at Stormore (Grid Reference F7) have more of their gardens included now whereas others, such as Shepherds Mead (Grid Reference F6) have less. A similar situation is evident in Petticoat Lane (Grid Reference K7</b>	F6, F7, K7, L7	Dilton Marsh PC (197)	Accept in part. The settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement

and L7). This appears perverse.			
<b>The Parish Council resolved that the Bullivant Site (Grid Reference L6) should remain OUTSIDE the Settlement Boundary – as at present.</b>	L6	Dilton Marsh PC (197)	Accept. In large villages, built employment development should be excluded from the boundary.

**Dinton**

No representations

**Fovant**

No representations

**Great Bedwyn**

No representations

**Great Somerford**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>A copy of the schematic from the plan is enclosed and you will see that our proposals for the new settlement boundary are shown by the blue hatched areas. For you convenience I will identify the new areas according to the grid references on the Council's schematic:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>HS Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP6.</b></li> </ul>	<p>H5; J5; J6; K7; H7</p> <p>See map 27</p>	<p>Great Somerford NP Steering Group (152, 153)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Great Somerford was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and conducts its own settlement boundary review.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JS Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP3.</li> <li>• J6 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NPS.</li> <li>• K7 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP2.</li> <li>• H7 Our proposal is covered by the area designated as NP1.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

**Great Wishford**

No representations

**Heytesbury**

No representations

**Hilperton**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Office Comments
<p>The Parish Council supports these three amendments but only because they are correcting an old mapping error. The parish Council would not support any further development north-east of Marsh Road.</p>	<p>F3/ 4,G/H 4 and H/I 4/5  See map 36</p>	<p>Hilperton Parish Council (16)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Parish Council accepts this amendment.</p>	<p>K/L 7</p>	<p>Hilperton Parish Council (18)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	See map 36		
<b>The Boundaries should be redrawn to include residential properties only, but excluding garages and gardens, which should be left outside the VPL, as indicated by the suggested line being shown in red on the map.</b>	L 8 (Old Rectory area) See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (19)	Reject. Curtilages of properties should be included within the settlement boundary unless they have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable</b>	L 9 (Square) See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (20)	Noted.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable and logical.</b>	L 9, M 9, N 9 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (21)	Noted.
<b>This should be redrawn more tightly to the houses, and the rectangle should be left out, i.e. the eastern end should be redrawn closer to the houses, as indicated by the suggested line being shown in red.</b>	O 8 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (22)	Reject. Built residential development and their curtilages should be included within the boundary where they physically relate to the settlement.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable</b>	O 10 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (23)	Noted.
<b>The boundaries should be redrawn tighter to the houses rather than the large gardens being included in the proposed revision, as indicated by the suggested line shown in red.</b>	N 10 (Southfield, West Wing) See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (24)	Accept in part. Remove area of gardens which more closely relate to the countryside and have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>The new line east of the existing boundary is not supported but the changes in the south-east corner are (as indicated on the map).</b>	M 10 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (25)	Accept. Follow existing boundary.
<b>The existing boundary should be</b>	L 10	Hilperton Parish Council (26,	Reject. The boundary should be amended to include the

<b>retained so it is tight to the two houses and excludes the gardens. The boundary line to 3 Stonelea should be redrawn as indicated on the map. The Parish Council accepts the new green line to the Lion and Fiddle car park.</b>	See map 36	27)	built form of the settlement including curtilages of properties and should follow clearly defined physical features – in this case the curtilage of the properties.
<b>Might this be a topographical error? The revision goes in more tightly and is supported.</b>	K 9 and K 10 - Green Square See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (28)	This area should be included within the boundary. Residential gardens closely related to the built form of the settlement should be included within the boundary.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable.</b>	K 8 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (29)	Noted. However the playing field of the school should be excluded from the boundary.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable.</b>	K 7 (school area) See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (30)	Noted.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable.</b>	K8 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (31)	Noted.
<b>Back of Horse Road. Should stay as original because of the gardens, as indicated on the map.</b>	H 6 and I 6 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (32)	Reject. Curtilages of properties should be included within the boundary where they physically relate to the settlement and do not have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.
<b>Continue the green straight across, as indicated in red.</b>	H 6 and H 7 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (33)	Reject. Curtilages of properties that have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement should be excluded from the boundary.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable.</b>	G 6 and G 7 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (34)	Noted.
<b>Revision as shown is acceptable.</b>	E 5 and F 5 and 4 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (35)	Noted.
<b>The new line east of the existing boundary is not supported but the changes in the south-east corner are.</b>	M 10 See map 36	Hilperton Parish Council (36)	Noted. Use existing boundary apart from in the south east corner.

<b>See attached maps</b>	See maps 2	G Menzies	Reject. The settlement boundary follows the built form of the settlement. The methodology states that permissions should not be included within the boundary. This area of land is more closely related to the countryside so should not be included within the boundary.
--------------------------	------------	-----------	---

### Hindon

No representations

### Holt

No representations

### Hullavington

No representations

### Kington St Michael

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>We are writing to request that the proposed settlement boundary in Kington St Michael be adjusted to include the northern section of our garden. Both the present and the proposed boundary runs a few feet from our kitchen window and cuts our garden in half.</b>	H4 (E)	Frank Hughes & Jehanne Le Quesne (11)	Accept. Amend boundary to include curtilage of properties that more closely relate to the settlement and to follow defined physical features.

### Ludwell

No representations

**Lyneham**

No representations

**Morgan's Vale & Woodfalls**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>To remain as a housing restraint area to preserve the rural characteristics in this vicinity.</b>	5G/H	Redlynch PC (79)	Reject. Policy H19 Housing Restraint Area, is no longer a saved policy. The new settlement boundary reflects the extent of the built environment and ensures parity between housing policy boundaries across Wiltshire.
<b>Unacceptable maintain existng boundary</b>	7/8G	Redlynch PC (80)	Reject. Built residential development physically related to the settlement should be included within the boundary. Curtilages of properties with the capacity to substantially extend the built form should be excluded.
<b>Unacceptable maintain existing property boundary</b>	8/9H	Redlynch PC (81)	Accept in part. Include rear of residential gardens but exclude field that more closely relates to the countryside.
<b>This encroaches into New Forest National Park boundary.</b>	8I		Accept. This is an isolated developed. Return to existing boundary.

**Netheravon**

No representations

**North Bradley**

No representations

**Oaksey**

No representations

**Pitton**

No representations

**Porton**

No representations

**Potterne**

No representations

**Purton**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>You appear to have incorrectly used the criterion to exclude from the Purton Village Settlement the Village Centre recreation playing fields and appurtenant buildings which are central to the village and which are in the heart of the conservation area.</b>	M & N 9 & 10	Purton PC (336)	Accept. Include recreational space closely related to the built area.
<b>You have incorrectly applied the definition to include two employment areas that are not part of the Purton village.</b>		Purton PC (336)	Accept. Remove area north of the railway line.

**Ramsbury**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>We would like to request that the area marked red on the enclosed</b>	L 5/6	Ramsbury & Axford PC (160, 161, 162)	Accept. Include within settlement boundary.

<b>plan is added to the revision of settlement boundary. this piece of land belongs to Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council ( see enclosed documents) and is intended for community use.</b>	See maps 30 & 31		
<b>Return to the original blue existing boundary line. This is Mill Lane, Ramsbury</b>	C,D/10,11 See map 32	Ramsbury & Axford PC (343)	Accept. Remove from settlement boundary. Physically detached from settlement (road/ river).
<b>Return to the original blue existing boundary line. This is the north side of Crowood Lane</b>	L/2,3 See map 32	Ramsbury & Axford PC (343)	Accept. Remove from settlement boundary. Physically detached from settlement (road).
<b>Return the line around The Old Mill, Scholarads Lane to the original blue existing boundary line. (The proposed line goes through the river and over land that floods). The line to the east of the road can remain.</b>	J/9 See map 32	Ramsbury & Axford PC (343)	Accept. Remove from settlement boundary. Physically detached from settlement (river).
<b>We would like to take the proposed boundary further west to include a small piece of land bought by the Parish Council for future community use. The piece is to the north of a small marked hard-standing area on the map</b>	O/4,5 See map 32	Ramsbury & Axford PC (343)	See first comment.
<b>I am greatly concerned by the inclusion of a parcel of land with frontage to Scholarads Lane and a road locally known as Spring Hill, previously excluded from the settlement. This vegetable garden currently</b>	See map 33	R B Hicklin (letter)	Accept. Remove from settlement boundary. Physically detached from settlement (road).

<p>forms part of the property known as The Old Mill on the other (western) side of the road. It has no connection with the two buildings to the east both of which have frontage to Scholards Lane / Newtown Road. I would request that this parcel of land be retained outside the Settlement boundary as its inclusion brings no material benefit to the village.</p>			
<p>We request that the boundary is moved further East to align with the property boundary so as to encompass the whole parcel of land as shown by the black dotted line in the above diagram.</p> <p>We would agree that the proposed settlement boundary should include the entire parcel of land known as the Black Barn as it supports the government and Wiltshire's Core Strategy to identify new developable land to meet increased future housing requirements.</p>	<p>See map 34</p>	<p>Mr David Langton (352)</p>	<p>Reject, this area is isolated on the southern side of the road from the main settlement.</p>

**Rowde**

No representations

**Rudloe**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
-------------------	----------------------	-------------	------------------

<b>Follow line of expected planning permission 13/05724/OUT Existing and extant planning permissions</b>	J7	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (125)	Reject. All unimplemented planning permissions are excluded from within the settlement boundary.
<b>Follow Skynet Drive This area is developed</b>	K8	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (126)	Reject. Isolated from the main settlement.
<b>Follow Park Lane This area is developed</b>	K9	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (127)	Reject. Isolated from the main settlement.
<b>Continue to follow Park Lane Former telephone exchange exclude.</b>	I/J9	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (128)	Reject. Isolated from the main settlement.
<b>Include play area Formal play areas included</b>	F/G 7/8	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (129)	Reject. Recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more to the open countryside is excluded from within the settlement boundary.
<b>Follow road More defined boundary</b>	H5	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (130)	Accept.
<b>Follow existing settlement boundary More defined boundary</b>	I5	Rudloe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (131)	Accept.
<b>Box Parish Council recommends that Park Avenue, Rudloe is removed from the proposals. These Houses were built in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances as MOD housing.</b>	G7, H7, G6, H6	Box PC (154)	Reject. Residential development that is physically related to the settlement is included within the settlement boundary.

**Send**

No representations

## Semington

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
The settlement line should exclude the entire field. i.e. Semington, Pound Lane, northern section of field bordering the road, between houses numbers 12 and 14.	H6	Timothy Vince (104) Steven Hall (112)	Accept. Remove field from the settlement boundary as it relates more to the countryside than to the settlement.
The line drawn across the back gardens of 16, 18 and 20 Pound Lane seems to be arbitrary and inequitable.	G6?	Timothy Vince (104)	Accept. The curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement is included.
Semington Parish Council cannot understand the reasons for the proposed new boundaries not following the normal curtilages of houses and field boundaries. For example, at Grid Reference G6 there is a horizontal (East/West) division of the field.	G6	Semington PC (116)	Accept. The curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement is included.

## Shalbourne

No representations

## Shaw / Whitley

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
-------------------	----------------------	-------------	------------------

<p><b>My concerns are:</b></p> <p>1. Albeit subject to relevant planning permission, residents in houses 9-12 &amp; 16a onwards would all be able to build in their back gardens</p> <p>4. Why is No 13 &amp; 14 particularly impacted ?</p>	<p>See map 35</p>	<p>Mr Russell Evans (352)</p>	<p>Accept. Boundary to follow curtilages of properties.</p>
--	-------------------	-------------------------------	---

**Sherston**

No representations

**Shrewton**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>The settlement boundary has been extended to include open land belonging to the School but everywhere else, the settlement boundary has been shrunk to exclude open land.</p>	<p>H 5 &amp; 6</p>	<p>Shrewton PC (98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103)</p>	<p>Accept. The settlement boundary will not include open land belonging to the school but does not exclude open land previously within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Two housing allocation areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main site for small dwellings. 64 or more small dwellings are being planned for this site, in a community, with communal environmental and energy conservation technologies. The proposed site occupies about 2.7 ha of</li> </ul>	<p>See map 36 &amp; 37</p>		<p>Reject. The revised methodology excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary.</p>

<p>some 13 ha contained in SHLAA 153 and 154.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A second site for individual care homes for the elderly, earmarked to support a Wilts Council initiative for ten locations for elderly care in the community. Ten or more small dwellings designed for the elderly with live-in care workers, in a community. This community is next to an existing community for the elderly, Hinde's Meadow. See Question 5.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Add the area of the Community Hall and Recreation Ground, which are major community facilities</b></p>	<p>H2, H3 See map 36 &amp; 37</p>	<p>Shrewton PC (98)</p>	<p>Accept. The recreation buildings to be included within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Add SHLAA 113 area earmarked for 10+ small homes for the elderly with live in care workers, as part of a Wilts Council initiative.</b></p>	<p>I3 See map 36 &amp; 37</p>	<p>Shrewton PC (99)</p>	<p>Reject. The revised methodology excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Add housing allocation area for 64+ new houses in part of the SHLAA 153 &amp; 154, and extend boundary to include existing village housing.</b></p>	<p>J3, K3, L3, M3, M2 See map 36 &amp; 37</p>	<p>Shrewton PC (99)</p>	<p>Reject. The revised methodology excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>New site for proposed sports facility, particularly cricket.</b></p>	<p>J6, J5, K6 See map 36 &amp; 37</p>	<p>Shrewton PC (100)</p>	<p>Reject. The revised methodology excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary.</p>

## Steeple Ashton

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>Back Gardens between Silver Street and the access road to 1, 3 and 5 Edington Road.</b>  <b>Why not leave it as it was, which would reflect the similar size area of back gardens left inside the settlement boundary for 3, 4 and 5 Home Farm Close (grid ref i8) on the other side of the main Edington Road?</b></p>	J8	Steeple Ashton PC (163)	Accept. The curtilage of these properties to be included within the settlement boundary.
<p><b>A3 at the northern end of the village. The proposed settlement boundary has eliminated the possibility of a small scale development with access from Common Hill.</b></p>	A3	Steeple Ashton PC (163)	Unsure of reference (A3 grid square is a long way from the settlement). However, future development sites could be allocated through a neighbourhood plan.
<p><b>Grid Ref: top of G4 - field north east of Common Hill, with access from Common Hill. Currently used as private allotments for the village. Steeple Ashton Parish Council would like this field brought inside of the proposed boundary, as it considers this field part of the existing settlement in the same way as the Acresshort Lane recreation field, rather than at the edge of the settlement. The field is bounded on 2 sides by existing settlement.</b></p>	G4	Steeple Ashton PC (163)	Reject. Recreational space at the edge of settlements that relates more to the countryside / has the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement should be excluded from the settlement boundary. Acresshort Lane field is not on the edge of the settlement and therefore should be included within the boundary.

<b>The western boundary does not follow a natural line. After the 3 most southerly properties in Acreshort Lane the proposed boundary is brought right in to the roadside. Steeple Ashton parish Council would like consideration to be given to letting the proposed boundary follow the natural line, as it considers that there would be no detriment to the street scene and would not extend the built form of the settlement.</b>	H8	Steeple Ashton PC (163)	Accept. The settlement boundary to follow and include the curtilage of the properties.
<b>Back Garden of the Longs Arms public house. Why has the pub garden been brought inside the proposed boundary?</b>	H7/ 17	Steeple Ashton PC (163)	Accept. Pub garden to be excluded from settlement boundary.

### Studley / Derry Hill

No representations

### Sutton Benger

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>We attach an ordnance survey extract showing the two parcels of land that we wish to be included in the structure plan, edged in red.</b>	See map 38	William Drury Ltd (282)	Reject. The two parcels of land are fields that relate more closely to the countryside and do not define the built area of the settlement.

## Sutton Veny

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>Object to proposed new boundary, which bisects property (Little Halse, Sutton Veny, BA12 7AT)</b>	I8?	Will Templer (13)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<b>Please review the land at Grid Reference G5+G6 as this is a vacant brownfield site that has the potential to be sustainable, suitable, available, achievable and deliverable.</b>	G5 and G6 See maps 39, 40 & 41	S+J OFM (188, 189, 190)	Reject. The settlement boundary does not include allocations. However, sites can be allocated through neighbourhood plans (or the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD).
<b>Please could you not remove our office from inside the boundaries since this does not fit the criterion of employment use. To ensure transparency in the decision making process, please inform us of why it was proposed to remove it in the first place.</b>	??	Beccy Santhouse (196)	Unable to locate without any reference.
<b>My property (1.Greenhill Gardens BA12 7AY) lies just within the present northern boundary, and has massive brick walls on two sides. The proposed boundary appears to run across my patio, thereby excluding 95% of my back garden from the village.</b>	H5	Michael Swann (296)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<b>I OBJECT to the proposed Settlement Boundary for the area at Sutton Veny shown on the</b>	See maps 42, 43, 44 & 45	Philip Clark (329)	Accept in part. Revert to original boundary.

<p>location identified in Enclosure 1.</p> <p>Referring to Enclosure 2. The Proposed Amendment plan.</p> <p>a) I own the property at 44 High Street, edged with a red line.</p> <p>b) The Council's proposed Settlement Boundary is the green line.</p> <p>c) My proposed Settlement Boundary is marked with green dots.</p> <p>d) The fields marked X are pasture.</p> <p>3. I propose the Settlement Boundary be adjusted to the dotted green line because,</p> <p>a) It follows the existing ground contours of Plots A and B.</p> <p>b) It is forms a natural and physical demarcation line.</p>			
<p>The existing Village boundary follows the boundary of my neighbour's property and mine. This is marked very clearly by fences, shrubbery and very mature trees. I believe the boundary has existed this way for a few hundred years at least.</p>	<p>??</p>	<p>Mark Donovan (333)</p>	<p>Unable to locate without any reference.</p>

<p>The proposed new boundary crosses my front garden in the middle of a lawn! This makes no sense whatever. There is nothing there to mark the position of the boundary, and I would end up with half of my front garden within the village and the other half outside it.</p>			
<p>See attached map. Please note: Land to the East has now secured planning permission.</p>	<p>See map 46 15</p>	<p>Mark Reynolds</p>	<p>Reject. The settlement boundary marks the built form of the settlement. This area is not built and relates more closely to the countryside than to the built form of the settlement. It should be excluded from the boundary. The settlement boundary does not include allocations. However, sites can be allocated through neighbourhood plans (or the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD).</p>

### The Winterbournes

No representations

### Tilshead

No representations

### Upavon

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p><b>Boxed Area of Fariers Fariers Field on the side of the A342. We accept</b></p>	<p>F6</p>	<p>Paul Cowan (251)</p>	<p>Noted but the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement will be included within the settlement boundary</p> <p>+</p>
<p><b>In view of current applications, should the area between Chicken Farm and Cemetry be involved??</b></p>	<p>E6.50F5</p>	<p>Paul Cowan (252)</p>	<p>Reject. All unimplemented planning permissions are excluded from within the settlement boundary.</p>

<b>Do not alter current boundary.</b>	G5	Paul Cowan (253)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<b>Maintain current boundary.</b>	H504	Paul Cowan (254)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<b>West Boundary Accept Proposal.</b>	H5	Paul Cowan (255)	Noted
<b>Accept all three changes.</b>	H6	Paul Cowan (256)	Noted
<b>Accept change.</b>	G6	Paul Cowan (257)	Noted
<b>Accept change</b>	J9	Paul Cowan (258)	Noted but the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement will be included within the settlement boundary
<b>In view of the fact that this school is mothballed by W/C this should be included in the future boundary.</b>	H8 & H9	Paul Cowan (259)	Accept. Built community facilities development (i.e. school) that is physically related to the development will be included within the settlement boundary. Revert to original boundary.
<b>Accept Modification</b>	J.8	Paul Cowan (260)	Noted but the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement will be included within the settlement boundary

## Urchfont

<b>Specific Comments</b>	<b>Grid reference / Map</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<b>At the present time the boundaries fall into two main areas with a small parcel of land between. My client owns that</b>	See map 47, 48 & 49	Brian Toogood (149, 150, 151)	The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.

<p>small parcel of land and requests that the settlement boundaries be amended to include that parcel of land and thereby join the two main sections of the village together.</p>			
<p><b>The current boundary incorporates part but not all of my garden in Spring Valley in the Bottom on the north side of the village.</b></p> <p><b>The revised boundary cuts this down so that the boundary takes in the house only and excludes the garden.</b></p> <p><b>There is an extraordinary bite taken out of the boundary on the north side of the village, which includes my garden, whereas the more sensible approach would seem to be that the appropriate dividing line should be the footpath that runs up the north side of spring valley. The postcode for reference is SN10 4SD - Hazeldene.</b></p>	<p>J5&amp;6</p>	<p>Dominic Hickey (202)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Re: Alcludia, The Ham, Urchfont, DEVIZES, Wiltshire, SN10 4SG</b></p> <p><b>Please will you modify the suggested new boundary to include our entire garden. Please see attached a copy of a drawing which is based on the details provided on the Ordnance Survey Map dated 1982. On the original</b></p>	<p>See map 50</p>	<p>RJ Bean (207)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.</p>

<p>map our property is wrongly identified as “Arcadia” it should be Alcudia. I have identified the boundary of our property in red.</p> <p>Please may we request that the revised village boundary is moved to the north and West, as it was previously, so that our entire garden is within it. It appears to me that it would be better if was moved so that it runs along the footpath known as ‘The Bash’ from Rose Cottage at the East, to the bottom of the garden of the property at the West which was known as ‘Gay Look’ (as marked on the attached drawing in green) so that it joins up with the rest of the proposed boundary. Hence all of our garden and also all of Hazeldene’s garden. (Marked on the drawing as ‘Spring Valley’) is included.</p>			
<p><b>The Parish Council and NP Steering Group also support the principle of the Boundary being on the north side of the B3098.</b></p>	<p>See maps 51 &amp; 52</p>	<p>Urchfont PC (212)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Extended to include whole yard.</b></p>	<p>F5 - F6</p>	<p>Urchfont PC (215)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.</p>
<p><b>Increased to take in whole garden.</b></p>	<p>H5</p>	<p>Urchfont PC (216)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an</p>

			advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.
<b>Small area now included.</b>	J5 - J6	Urchfont PC (217)	The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.
<b>Two areas included, one has already been built on.</b>	I8	Urchfont PC (218)	The settlement boundary for Urchfont was not reviewed by Wiltshire Council. The Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage and is considered to have reviewed its settlement boundary.

**West Lavington & Littleton Panell**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>This is the largest change and introduces a significant extension to the boundary. It includes A'Beckett s House and four other houses ( one of which is a recent replacement dwelling ). However, this is no different from the previous situation. More significantly it includes the substantial garden of A'Becketts ( probably well in excess of 2 acres ) running parallel to the High Street which still makes an appreciable gap between the next houses on the High Street.</b>	G3	West Lavington PC (51)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.

<p>The inclusion of this land at present would represent a change in status which could precipitate an immediate planning application which would be better considered within the Neighbourhood Plan. For this reason, and without prejudice to any possible Plan proposals, this projected change is therefore not supported.</p>			
<p>This proposal is to include a significant piece of land surrounding a large freestanding house between the High Street and Pagnell Lane. The land proposed is only the immediate surroundings to the house which stands in much larger grounds ( several acres ). As such the boundary does not appear to have any clear definition on the ground. This proposal appears unnecessary.</p> <p>A second proposal in this area seeks to tighten the boundary on the edge of the garden on the west side of Pagnell Lane. It appears to cut across the garden and exclude part of the plot from the settlement. This appears inconsistent with the principal criterion and without reason and is not supported.</p>	<p>F3</p>	<p>West Lavington PC (51)</p>	<p>Accept. Revert to original boundary.</p>
<p>This proposal seeks to draw a line across the rear gardens of about three houses on the east side of</p>	<p>G4</p>	<p>West Lavington PC (52)</p>	<p>Accept and noted. Revert to original boundary where the proposed boundary is seeking to contract.</p>

<p><b>the High Street. There appears to be no purpose to this and it contradicts the principal criterion and is therefore not supported .</b></p> <p><b>A separate G4 proposal is to extend the boundary to incorporate 2 houses on the eastern edge, one of which has recently been rebuilt on a larger scale. The proposal follows the plot boundary and updates the position and is therefore recommended.</b></p> <p><b>A third G4 proposal affects a small plot to the west of the High Street where a new line is shown deviating from the footpath alignment into a less developed garden plot. Again this appears inconsistent with the principal criterion and is not necessary and not supported.</b></p>			
<p><b>This proposal is to extend the boundary to go all around the edge of the house plots that have been developed to the rear of Littleton Farm. This updates the situation, follows the plot boundary and therefore the principal criterion. ( This change is in marked contrast to other areas where the boundary has been proposed to cut across gardens. )</b></p> <p><b>There is also further tidying up of the boundary in both the top left</b></p>	G5	West Lavington PC (53)	Noted.

and bottom right hand corners of G5/G6 which again follow the footpath. All of these changes are therefore recommended.			
<b>This proposal seeks to draw the boundary more tightly on land to the rear of houses on the east of the High Street again cutting across some rear gardens and ruling out an adjacent larger area. Part of this area has previously been registered as a SHLAA site although gaining access has proved difficult. As a SHLAA site it is under consideration within the Neighbourhood Plan to determine if it could provide useful infill potential for increasing the housing stock in the village.</b>	H5	West Lavington PC (54)	Noted. However, the rear gardens is now included, although the larger open space area is excluded.
<b>This proposal amends the boundary to reflect the approved development of new buildings within the Dauntsey's complex adjacent to the playing fields. As such it updates the boundary and complies with the criterion and is therefore recommended.</b>	H8	West Lavington PC (55)	Noted.
<b>This proposal affects about 6 houses on the north side of Lavington Lane and seeks to draw the boundary line through the middle of their gardens. The gardens are not particularly long, the proposal conflicts with the Council's own principal criterion</b>	I6	West Lavington PC (56)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.

and appears to have no real purpose. The proposal is not supported.			
This proposal affects 3 houses on the north side of Sunnyside which back onto Dauntsey's playing fields. It seeks to take the boundary across the middle of their gardens, which are not particularly long. This is similar to the Lavington Lane proposals and has no purpose and is in conflict with the principal criterion. The proposal is not supported.	I8	West Lavington PC (57)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
All these proposals represent minor tidying up amendments to the boundary which appear to conform with the principal criterion and the current situation and are therefore recommended.	J6,7,8,9, I7 and K9	West Lavington PC (58)	Noted.

**Westwood**

No representations

**Whiteparish**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
Rectangle is a field and should be excluded. Square is school playing field and	H8	Whiteparish PC (43)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.

<b>should be excluded.</b>			
<p><b>There is a property currently being built on part of the land that you have excluded (13/02577/FUL). This should be included.</b></p> <p><b>However the neighbour's garden should remain excluded.</b></p> <p><b>There is a small area in the Church Yard where the existing boundary should remain.</b></p>	H7	Whiteparish PC (44)	Accept. Revert to original boundary and include church building.
<p><b>Section of rectangle currently has a property being built on it (14/05240/FUL). This should be included.</b></p> <p><b>However the neighbour's garden should remain excluded.</b></p>	K5	Whiteparish PC (45)	Accept in part. Revert to original boundary.
<p><b>2 houses with large gardens – why have you not moved the boundary to comply with curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement?</b></p>	I4	Whiteparish PC (46)	Reject. The curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) and/ or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement is included within the settlement boundary.
<p><b>Why has this rectangular strip been added? Move back to original boundary.</b></p>	H5	Whiteparish PC (47)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<p><b>This is The Fountain Public House car park and should be excluded.</b></p>	G6	Whiteparish PC (48)	Accept. Revert to original boundary.
<p><b>Small rectangle which falls under isolated development which is</b></p>	E7 and F7	Whiteparish PC (49)	Reject. Retain original boundary.

<p>physically or visually detached from the settlement including farm buildings or agricultural buildings. This should be excluded.</p>			
---	--	--	--

**Winsley**

No representations

**Winterslow**

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<p>I would like for the whole of my property to be included in the draft settlement boundary plan. I have a plot that is split into two parts by a road running through the middle (Middleton rd). On the north side of the road is a bungalow and garden (thrush green), on the south side is a couple of sheds and brick built garage surrounded by a established hedge row (area shaded red). Currently the north side is included in the draft settlement boundary and the south side isn't.</p> <p>Below is a copy of my title plan showing thrush green on the north side of Middleton road (surrounded by blue), the plot that I would like include in the draft</p>	<p>J5 See maps 53 &amp; 54</p>	<p>Sam Lloyd (7)</p>	<p>Accept. Include area of built development closely related to the settlement.</p>

settlement boundary on the south side (shaded red) and a screen shot of J5 of the draft settlement boundary.			
<b>N.E. Side of Tytherley Road</b>	N5-N6 See maps 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (262)	Reject. The settlement boundary defined the built form of the settlement. This field should not be included within the boundary as it is closely related to the countryside.
<b>NE side of Typherley road (Developed Area).</b>	06-07 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (263)	Accept. Include area of built residential development physically related to the settlement.
<b>SE Side of Tytherley Road (Developed Area).</b>	N6-06 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (264)	Accept. Include area of built residential development physically related to the settlement.
<b>SE Side of Tytherley Road</b>	N6-N5 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (265)	Accept in part. Include area of built residential development physically related to the settlement.
<b>SE side of Middleton Road</b>	H3-H4-I4 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (266)	Reject. The settlement boundary defined the built form of the settlement. This area should not be included within the boundary as it is closely related to the countryside.
<b>NE side of Highfield Crescent (Running NW-SE)</b>	H4 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (267)	Reject. The settlement boundary defined the built form of the settlement. This area should not be included within the boundary as it is closely related to the countryside.
<b>Between Highfield Crescent &amp; Brown's Copse</b>	H4 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (268)	Reject. The settlement boundary defined the built form of the settlement. This area should not be included within the boundary as it is closely related to the countryside.
<b>Triangular Plot east of Woodland Drive under development</b>	H3 See map 53 & 54	Winterslow PC (269)	Accept. Include within settlement boundary as the plot is currently under development.
<b>Omit inclusion of bacildrove running NW-SE. Boundary to S.W. frontage of development.</b>	C7 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (270)	Reject. Built residential and employment development closely related to the settlement should be included within the settlement boundary.
<b>Omit inclusion of all Farm Budge but include Dufulling &amp; Barn Attached.</b>	C7-C6 See map 55 & 56	Winterslow PC (271)	Reject. Built residential and employment development closely related to the settlement should be included within the settlement boundary.

## Worton

Specific Comments	Grid reference / Map	Respondents	Officer Comments
<b>The boundary to the north of the three houses at the west of the grid square should be brought closer to the houses to be consistent with the boundary to houses on either side.</b>	H6 See map 57	Worton PC (241, 242)	Accept the need for consistency. Revert to original boundary.
<b>The buildings and associated land used for the local coach business to the north of the boundary line should be regarded as functionally &amp; physically related to the village and should be included within the boundary.</b>	I6 See map 57	Worton PC (243)	Employment development at the edge of large villages should be excluded from the boundary.
<b>The proposed new boundary line cuts back to the High Street to exclude two small fields. These fields are not part of the open countryside. The boundary should be re-drawn to include these fields.</b>	I6 See map 57	Worton PC (244)	Reject. This area of open land is more closely related to the countryside than to the settlement.
<b>Boundary to north of the houses at far east of grid square should be brought closer to the houses in order to be more consistent with the boundaries to the houses on either side.</b>	J5 See map 57	Worton PC (245)	Accept the need for consistency. Revert to original boundary.
<b>The boundary around the finger of land running south should be brought back towards the house</b>	J6 See map 57	Worton PC (246)	Revert to original boundary.

on the south side of the High Street, consistent with the boundaries to properties on either side.			
--	--	--	--

**Yatton Keynell**

No representations

**Part 2: Maps Submitted With Comments On Individual Settlements**

# Principle Settlements

---

*Trowbridge*

*Map: 1*

*Respondent: G.F.Menzies*