



Working towards a Core Strategy for Wiltshire

# Topic paper 3: Settlement strategy

Addenda

Wiltshire Core Strategy  
Consultation January 2012

### **Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

This paper is an addendum to one of 16 topic papers, listed below, which form part of the evidence base in support of the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. These topic papers have been produced in order to present a coordinated view of some of the main evidence that has been considered in drafting the emerging Core Strategy. It is hoped that this will make it easier to understand how we have reached our conclusions. The papers are all available from the council website:

Topic Paper 1: Climate Change

Topic Paper 2: Housing

Topic Paper 3: Settlement Strategy

Topic Paper 4: Rural Signposting Tool

Topic Paper 5: Natural Environment

Topic Paper 6: Retail

Topic Paper 7: Economy

Topic Paper 8: Infrastructure and Planning Obligations

Topic Paper 9: Built and Historic Environment

Topic Paper 10: Transport

Topic Paper 11: Green Infrastructure

Topic Paper 12: Site Selection Process

Topic Paper 13: Military Issues

Topic Paper 14: Building Resilient Communities

Topic Paper 15: Housing Requirement Technical Paper

Topic Paper 16: Gypsy and Travellers

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

# Contents

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 The Core Strategy consultation**
- 3.0 Overarching policy**
- 4.0 Strategic settlements**
- 5.0 Challenge of approach to non-strategic settlements**
- 6.0 Non-Strategic Settlements**
- 7.0 Vision and Strategy for Villages and Rural Areas**
- 8.0 Key Challenges for the Villages and Rural Areas**
- 9.0 Development at Non-Strategic Settlements & Policy Wording**
- 10.0 Redrafting the Policy**
- 11.0 Challenge - Settlement Boundaries**
- 12.0 Wiltshire Core Strategy and South Wiltshire Core Strategy**

**Appendix A – Settlement Types and Full Settlement Strategy**

**Appendix B – South Wiltshire Settlements**

**Appendix C – Settlement Strategy**

**Appendix D – Assessment of Saved Local Plan Policies**

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This addendum has been prepared following consultation during the summer of 2011 on the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document 'Working toward a Core Strategy for Wiltshire'. This addendum analyses responses to Question 1 which was exclusively focused on Core Policy 1 – The Settlement Strategy. It describes the changes that are being made in light of the consultation and proposed changes in national and regional policy. The paper also has a secondary focus to address policies related to small settlements and rural development in the submission draft of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.
- 1.2 Work on the emerging Wiltshire and South Wiltshire Core Strategies has led to commitments to redress policies on small settlements. The commitments can be found in CoMoR Report published in June 2010<sup>1</sup> and a Full Council resolution during the submission of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy<sup>2</sup>. The latest consultation working towards the Core Strategy went some way to addressing issues highlighted by these commitments. However, response to the latest consultation and the publication of the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), alongside further clarification of the Localism Bill, has led to policies on small settlements needing to be redrafted in order to meet the ambitious nature of challenges in rural areas.
- 1.3 This addendum sets out changes to the settlement strategy policy that will be taken forward to the submission draft of the Core Strategy. It should be noted that this addendum should be read alongside the original topic paper, especially pages 33 – 49 which focus on best practice and policy development and help explain the process and evidence that has led to the identification of the policies that are being proposed.

### 2.0 The Core Strategy – Consultation

- 2.1 The most recent consultation on the core strategy took place between 13<sup>th</sup> June and 8<sup>th</sup> August in 2011. The consultation document set out a completely new settlement strategy based around feedback from an earlier consultation, the Wiltshire 2026 document<sup>3</sup>, and changes in national and regional policy. Previously, the settlement strategy had been heavily based on the South West Regional Spatial Strategy, following the Government's decision to revoke regional strategies the settlement strategy and accompanying policies were re-designed.
- 2.2 The context for the spatial strategy is the overall distribution of employment and housing set out in core policy 2. The strategy has an urban focus and deliberately seeks to direct development to the larger towns and cities of Wiltshire. Consequently, the strategy does not specify allocations to non-strategic settlements, the rural towns and villages. The overall levels of growth for rural areas are broken down by Community Area. Following the initial

---

<sup>1</sup> Consultation Methodology Output Report

<sup>2</sup> Full Council November 2009

<sup>3</sup> Wiltshire 2026

work of bringing together a number of strategies in the Wiltshire 2026 document three challenges were identified that needed to be met in the latest draft policy.

**Challenge SS1**

Re-examine the approach to the rural non-strategic settlements defining a strategy that allows the communities to meet their needs in the most sustainable manner.

**Challenge SS2**

Define the types of development which should come forward in general terms at non-strategic settlements.

**Challenge SS3**

Outline a consistent approach to settlement boundaries that allows the right level of protection to the open countryside without restricting appropriate development.

2.3 The settlements identified as strategic settlements, principal settlements and market towns, remained the same following the Wiltshire 2026 consultation. The key differences in policy at the strategic settlements were in wording and the focused community area strategies. The substantial differences were at the non-strategic settlements where a completely new structure and policy was consulted on, due in part to the resolutions in paragraph 1.2, but also because of the changing policy context. Changes to both national and local policy demanded a difference response from Wiltshire as a local planning authority. More details about the formation of the policy are presented in the original topic paper.

2.4 The table below summarises the main issues raised in the consultation, these are briefly discussed in turn. The consultation report expands on the consultation that was carried out and also provides a full list of comments in the appendices.

Subject	Summary of consultation comments
Overall Approach	The overall approach of using a settlement strategy to identify locations of development was widely understood and accepted. A large number of respondents offered support for the settlement strategy or offered conditional support in regard to being happy with the strategy if either some minor changes to the policy wording or structure was amended. A number of consultees supported the settlement strategy providing it was read coherently with the subsequent policies and proposals that are included in the draft Core Strategy document.
Principal settlements	The main issue commented on was the policy wording. The policy should be clear that it expects an appropriate level of growth in facilities to meet the needs of larger populations, it was highlighted that this reflects more accurately the aims and ambitions of other core policies and strategic objectives.  A number of consultees felt that the policy description did not reflect the range of settlements identified as principal settlements. It is important to set out that the level of development is tailored to the individual settlement and it should be explicitly highlighted that the settlements have different roles.

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Market Towns	<p>It was noted that the category of market towns included a large range of settlements that have different roles in Wiltshire. The amount of development should reflect the different role and the different constraints at each settlement. In relation to Market Towns it should also be noted that they have the 'potential' to be the focus of the appropriate development.</p> <p>A number of respondents noted that development must come forward with the appropriate community facilities and felt the policy should be worded to ensure a timely delivery schedule. There was wide spread support for the concept of phasing development and a number of respondents highlighted specific settlements where this will be appropriate.</p>
Local Service Centres	<p>The majority of respondents were happy with the designation of local service centres and they felt that the correct settlements were included in this tier. The wording 'locally significant' made a number of people nervous in terms of future sites and it was suggested that it should focus on the wording that looked at the amount of development being closely related to safeguarding their role in a rural area.</p> <p>Overall this category was recognised as an appropriate designation for the rural areas in Wiltshire. Some respondents expressed a desire to see housing and employment allocations for those settlements categorised as local service centres and thought the Core Strategy should identify a number of sites in a similar fashion to those at the strategic settlements.</p>
Approach to Villages	<p>There was widespread support for the new approach to villages. The majority of respondents indicated that the wider, less rigorous system of policy restraint was more in line with ambitions of rural settlements. The relationship between settlement boundaries and development was widely questioned. A number of people asked for more definition about exactly what is meant by 'modest'. And thought there should be a stronger definition in the document of what constitutes a "small site". The use of neighbourhood plans for further development was generally supported and it was suggested that there could be more explicit reference to the views of the community as voiced through the Neighbourhood Plan or a Referendum.</p> <p>A number of respondents did not support the policy of indentifying villages at all. They felt that all settlements are appropriate and should be subject to some development. There was also a concern that some of the wording would appear to provide the ability to oppose development proposals which would otherwise conform to national policy and sustainable development objectives.</p>
Settlement boundaries	<p>Development outside of village boundaries received a mixed response. Some felt that there was a 'bland sentence' that says some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries. They felt that this statement would allow scope for a large number of green field development proposals. On the other hand some felt that sites that are well related to an existing settlement, could be defined as sites that whilst not immediately adjacent to a settlement are still within walking distance to the services within the nearby village and should be considered for development. The need for development to extend beyond boundaries at settlements was widely accepted given the age and current restrictions of the boundaries as they exist.</p>

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

	<p>At small villages there was less consensus though this was mainly linked to people expressing not to understand the relationship between limited infill development without a settlement boundary. The majority of the respondents who expressed some concern felt that the removal of boundaries may cause issues with over development. However, this was limited to smaller settlements where boundaries currently exist. Small villages without boundaries identified that the policy was correct and would allow villages some limited infill.</p>
Specific comments about a settlement	<p>There were a number of comments that related to individual settlements. The majority of these were about strategic settlements and focussed on issues around the amount or location of development at these settlements. The main concern for the settlement strategy was that the status of a settlement implied a level of development above what was appropriate. A number of comments also focused on specific constraints which meant that even identifying certain settlements for increased levels of development was inappropriate.</p> <p>At smaller non-strategic settlements the majority of comments concerned incorrect information being used in the assessment of a settlement. Some smaller settlements that were either excluded or considered to be in the wrong category were highlighted.</p>
Housing numbers	<p>There were a large number of comments that focused on overall housing numbers and numbers at specific settlements. The majority of these did not support the housing allocations as they stand and felt that too many houses were being delivered.</p>
Swindon	<p>There were a number of comments supporting not identifying any development in the west of Swindon area, which was formerly indentified for an urban extension to Swindon.</p>
AONB	<p>The settlement strategy should take more account of the AONBs when formulating the strategy. The Cranbourne Chase AONB management team also voiced specific concerns over the job growth at Warminster and the effect on the AONB. Within AONBs housing and employment provision should be based on "local need" and being of a "small scale.</p>
Objection	<p>There were a number of objections to overall approach of defining settlements. However, the majority of these were linked to the employment and housing growth that the strategy was predicated on and the fact that it looked to identify a higher tier of settlements. .</p>

### Responding to the consultation

- 2.5 This addendum outlines the changes that have occurred following the consultation and analysis of the new national and regional policy. The changes are broken down by the subject they are addressing, including the response to the three challenges outlined above.

### 3.0 Overarching Policy

- 3.1 The Government published a draft National Planning Policy Framework in July 2011, the aim of which was to simplify planning policy at a national level and consolidate the various planning policy documents into one document. The draft National Planning Policy

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Framework (NPPF) outlines that it considers development plans to be the main delivery mechanism of the overarching objective of sustainable development. The NPPF states that:

- 3.2 'To this end, they should be consistent with the objectives, principles and policies set out in this Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development. (Paragraph 20)'
- 3.3 The NPPF still expects Local Plans to set out where they expect the opportunities for development to exist and should be explicit on what will or will not be permitted where. This is similar and consistent with current national policy and still places an emphasis on the settlement strategy to quantify spatially the best locations for development in Wiltshire. The NPPF expects that Local Plans should be aspirational and it is felt that the more inclusive approach to rural settlements of the current strategy responds to this agenda.
- 3.4 The policy will be amended to explain the distinction in the settlement strategy between strategic and non strategic settlements. An introductory paragraph will outline this difference and explain how this will help meet the needs of Wiltshire's communities now and in the future (sustainable development). This is considered the crucial role of the settlement strategy in outlining where development should take place. In this way the settlement strategy will outline, at a strategic level, where Wiltshire considers the right location for sustainable development to take place is responding directly the draft NPPF.

### 4.0 Strategic Settlements

- 4.1 There was a fundamental issue with what the policy was trying to achieve in terms of the strategic settlements. While it set out the broad development type at strategic settlements it did not set out a policy position in regards to development, particularly in terms of location and settlement boundaries.
- 4.2 As stated, the changes at strategic settlements in the latest consultation document revolved around the policy wording. The issues identified in the table above have been addressed in the formation of policy text for the submitted core strategy. The changes made are summarised below:
  - The strategy will reflect that the settlements identified as principal settlements and market towns are not a homogenous group. It is important to make clear that each settlement has its own independent issues, constraints and development needs. The individual community area strategies are there to provide this outline, however this will be signposted and cross-referenced in the supporting text of core policy 1 to ensure that the right development takes place in line with the role and function of each settlement.
  - The policy also needs to make it clear that an appropriate level of growth in facilities is needed for the larger amount of development that is being directed to the principal settlements and market towns. This not only reflects the aims and ambitions of other core policies and the strategic objectives as set out in the draft Core Strategy, it responds directly to comments received consistently during the consultation. Policy wording will be amended to reflect the importance of this ambition.
  - A key feature of the policy for market towns should reflect that these settlements have the potential to absorb significant development. The policy currently describes them as having the ability. However, in more than one case there are significant barriers to be overcome before development can take place. In some ways this mirrors the issue of

individuality. It is important that this distinction is stressed at the market towns where the level of evidence is less than the principal settlements. There are, in some cases, a number of crucial pieces of work that will need to be finished before sites for development can be identified.

## **5.0 Challenge SS1 Approach to Non-Strategic settlements**

5.1 Three options were considered to respond to challenge SS1:

- Only identify strategic settlements.
- Identify a full hierarchy of settlements and locations where development is now appropriate. A caveat should be added to allow settlements to change their role through other planning documents.
- Identify strategic settlements and other settlements but do not define hierarchy.

5.2 In the end the second option was chosen because the Core Strategy is compelled to 'broadly outline where development will be appropriate' (PPS12) and the lessons of best practice, including the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, where this approach has been shown to be sound, while offering the highest environmental protection the core strategy can offer. As stated above the draft NPPF continues to support this policy approach.

5.3 In accordance with the chosen option of identifying rural towns and villages across Wiltshire, the latest consultation draft of the core strategy included a new approach to identifying villages. This approach was based on feedback from the last consultation and best practice (see pages 7-15 of the main topic paper). This analysis looked to identify settlements where development would be inappropriate, while offering a flexible approach for villages in the strategy. The analysis had five themes:

- Basic analysis;
- Population and employment;
- Transport and communications;
- Leisure, recreation and other facilities;
- Developable land and constraints.

5.4 Each of themes has a number of indicators that were used to understand which villages should be classified as large/small and those settlements that represent unsustainable locations. This system was not designed to differentiate between each individual settlement, but to understand from a strategic perspective which of the rural settlements represented the most sustainable locations for some limited development (the Large Villages), and which settlements had limited opportunities and should be subject to limited development (the Small Villages).

5.5 The core strategy has also considered the issue of village clustering. This reflects that in some rural areas services and facilities are fairly sparse and that there are a number of villages that are close geographically that act in partnership with each other to support what facilities do exist. There are only a limited number of such clusters identified through direct feedback from certain communities in the core strategy. There are also a number of other studies or collaborative pieces of work that could be included in the assessment in identifying non-strategic settlements. These are focused studies with education and transport around congestion, road and school capacity. However, the detail of this work, and the use of clustering villages to support the more rural areas, is more appropriate for subsequent DPDs such as Neighbourhood Plans.

- 5.6 The principle of understanding which villages provide a sustainable location for growth is well established within policy and this approach has been recently been found sound in the South Wiltshire. As such it is not proposed to make any changes to the current method and structure (see table 2 below). Changes will only be made to individual settlements where direct feedback has been received.

<b>Non-Strategic Settlements</b>
<b>Local Service Centres</b> Local Service Centres are defined as smaller towns and larger villages which serve a surrounding rural hinterland and possess a level of facilities and services that, together with improved local employment, provide the best opportunities outside the Market Towns for greater self containment.
<b>Large Villages</b> Large Villages have been defined as settlements with a limited range of employment, services and facilities.
<b>Small Villages</b> Small Villages have a low level of services and facilities, and few employment opportunities.

- 5.7 There is also a clear mechanism for small villages to amend their status where development will bring an improvement in services and facilities. This mechanism is limited to small villages becoming large villages as the conditions for a settlement to justify being either a local service centre or market town are not thought to be achievable in the lifetime of the plan. Such a large shift in the influence of a settlement can be reviewed as part of general review of the core strategy. There are no plans to amend the following text.

4.16 Where proposals for improved local employment opportunities and/or new services and facilities at Small Villages arise through community led Neighbourhood Plans, such villages may be able to become more sustainable and their status change to that of 'Large Villages' as a result. Any change of status will need to be justified as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.

- 5.8 The consultation has highlighted a number of issues with assessment of certain villages and with up-to-date information the following changes are being proposed for these settlements:

- Beanacre

## 6.0 Non-Strategic Settlements

- 6.1 As the tiers of the settlement strategy will remain, the main issue for this addendum is to consider the policy response to this framework for the smaller rural settlements of Wiltshire, essentially the response to challenges SS2 & SS3. This is the main task of this addendum and thus it is important to briefly summarise the issues faced by Wiltshire's rural communities and the strategy and vision that has been identified as part of the work toward a core strategy.
- 6.2 There are over 250 villages and hamlets in Wiltshire that have not been identified as strategic settlements. These range from centres such as Cricklade and Pewsey that service large rural hinterland to small disjointed hamlets. Each of Wiltshire's villages has its own

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

unique character and many have village design statements and designated conservation areas which help to conserve and enhance their distinctive character.

- 6.3 Wiltshire's rural areas have a number of varied and significant landscapes and important areas of biodiversity value including parts of three AONB's, the New Forest Natural Park and the Salisbury Plain, one of the largest semi-natural grassland areas in Europe. These attractive rural areas have given rise and are part of the unique offer that characterise Wiltshire.
- 6.4 Successive planning regimes have sought to protect rural life and this has led to restrictive policies on building and development in the countryside. While these policies have undoubtedly protected rural areas they have created a number of issues that has seen traditional rural lifestyles become threatened with existing communities becoming unviable.
- 6.5 The Core Strategy needs to address these issues by providing a policy which offers the right level of protection while also affording the opportunity for the right level of development to support the future needs of the community.

### 7.0 Vision and Strategy for Villages and Rural Areas

- 7.1 The core strategy set out 10 strategic objectives which provide a series of key outcomes to deliver the spatial vision. A number of these outcomes can guide the approach to non-strategic settlements and development in rural areas. The list below is not exclusive and *strategic objective 2: to address climate change* and *strategic objective 5: to protect and enhance the natural environment* include many relevant outcomes that are an intrinsic part of rural policy.
- The rural economy will have diversified where appropriate (Strategic Objective(SO)1)
  - Wiltshire's tourism sector will have grown in a sustainable way, ensuring the protection and where possible enhancement of Wiltshire's natural, cultural and built environment assets. (SO1)
  - More modest growth proportionate to the size of the settlement will have been delivered in smaller settlements. (SO3)
  - Development will have avoided encroachment on the Western Wiltshire Green Belt. (SO3)
  - A positive contribution will have been made to help areas of social exclusion, especially access to essential services in the rural areas. (SO4)
  - More effective planning controls will have resulted in the retention of existing facilities such as village shops and pubs. (SO4)
  - Features and areas of historical and cultural value will have been conserved and where possible enhanced. (SO6)
  - Wiltshire's distinctive built heritage will have been used as reference points for new developments. (SO6)
  - Rural facilities will, as far as possible, have been maintained and enhanced. (SO9)
- 7.2 Further details can be found in Vision and Objectives background paper that supported the Wiltshire 2026 Consultation and the draft Topic Papers

### 8.0 Key Challenges for the Villages and Rural Areas

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

- 8.1 The vision and objectives provide a number of outcomes that can be used to identify what policies in the rural areas need to address. These outcomes are characterised by the issues to which they relate; economic, housing, community facilities and the environmental.
- 8.2 These key challenges facing rural areas have received much attention both nationally and through local research and analysis. For the purpose of this note a brief summary is presented of the key topics above. The majority of this information has been collected from national documents including; the Matthew Taylor Report and The Rural Challenge. Local research has utilised the Wiltshire Town and Country Themes report, an analysis of community aspirations from Community Area Plans, Parish Plans and Village Design Statements, and various studies that have contributed to the core strategy's evidence base, such as the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Study and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- 8.3 The rural economy and working lifestyles of economically active residents have seen huge changes in recent decades as traditional rural industries and employment have seen pronounced declines. The majority of the economically active residents in rural Wiltshire now commute further to their places of work. However, improvements in transport and mobility and modern working practices, such as large increases in home-based working, have seen the ability of residents to access work remain. The key economic challenges facing the villages and rural areas are:
- ensuring that traditional rural industries, such as farming and equine activities, remain viable. Diversification of business into subsidiaries such as tourism and recreation will allow these vital industries that are so important to stewardship of the rural area.
  - supporting new types rural enterprises to take advantage of improved communications and coordinated rural hubs and business locations. This will include supporting new patterns of employment and working practices.
  - providing further opportunities to enhance Wiltshire's outstanding tourism assets and ensure that the vibrant visitor economy continues to provide rural employment.
- 8.4 The most marked effect of restrictive rural policies has been on delivery of new housing. Historically villages have seen low rates of housing delivery which have brought about issues for the existing community in accessing the housing market. Successive generations of rural communities young and vulnerable have been forced to move away to urban areas due to increasing house prices and the dwindling or often complete lack of affordable housing. Key policy drivers such as rural exception policies have not enabled significant changes in delivery in rural areas. The key challenges for housing in villages and rural areas are:
- enabling new mechanisms for the delivery, such as incentivising rural exception sites and/or simply allowing more development, to help secure high levels of affordable housing. This includes private rented and social rented homes
  - ensuring that new housing developments respect local character and appearance and are designed so that occupants are able to take part in rural life and contribute to the community.
  - providing for a lack of smaller homes coming onto the market, developments are needed that are sensitive to the housing needs of the community.
- 8.5 Rural services and facilities have declined across the country in recent decades. Wiltshire has not been immune from these trends although it may be argued that rural areas of Wiltshire have retained services and facilities in greater numbers when compared to other areas. Nevertheless, the decline in rural facilities such as shops, pubs, schools and GP surgeries combined with a reliance on private cars has again affected the more vulnerable parts of

society. This decline in facilities may be exacerbated by cuts in public transport and other measures that support communities. Again, those with more limited means are likely to be more affected, although the decline facilities has and will continue to affect all those who live and work in rural areas. The key challenges in community facilities are:

- measures to address the continuing decline in the number of permanent local services (village shops, pubs, schools, GP surgeries).
- providing public transport when it is expected to decline in rural areas. In more isolated areas and where current services are infrequent strategies are required to preserve and improve community led schemes and access to services on strategic routes.

8.6 The character and attractive nature of rural Wiltshire has brought numerous benefits to Wiltshire's settlements and rural lifestyles are highly valued by our communities. However, with increasing pressure for development across many rural areas there are a number of tensions being created within landscapes, rich bio diverse areas and other significant areas of valued countryside. Development in rural areas must contribute to the continuing stewardship of the countryside and protect key countryside assets such as SSSs, AONBs and others. The key environmental challenges facing villages and rural areas are:-

- protecting areas of rich biodiversity. Salisbury Plain Special Area of Conservation is one of the largest semi-natural grasslands remaining in Europe. There are many other areas of outstanding biodiversity.
- protecting Wiltshire's valued landscapes. The setting of rural settlements must remain a priority throughout all new development proposals. Wiltshire includes three AONB's as well as Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage site. The historic character of many areas in Wiltshire should have particular significance.
- the need to address challenges faced by the legacy of major developments that have taken place in Wiltshire's rural areas. In particular, the MOD has developed significant assets across the Wiltshire, and over time their needs for these will change.

8.7 The objectives, outcomes and challenges that have been briefly identified above provide the framework for what policies within the core strategy need to address in rural areas to 2026. There are a number of policies that will help address these challenges and achieve the objectives and the settlement strategy is just one of them. Topic Paper 4 expands further on the objectives and challenges for rural areas and signposts where the rural challenges have been addressed in policy.

## 9.0 SS2 Development at Non-Strategic Settlements & Policy Wording

9.1 The policy wording and supporting paragraphs in core policy 1 relating to development at non-strategic settlements proved the most contentious part of the settlement strategy. Overall there is support for the general direction and approach that had been taken since the first iteration of the policy in the Wiltshire 2026 document. Nevertheless, the policies as they are currently written had a number of issues highlighted through the summer 2011 consultation, continuing internal consultation and the likely changes to the planning system. More details about the consultation can be found in the consultation report.

9.2 The consultation responses, summarised in table 1, that were specific to villages often concerned the relationship between development and settlement boundaries. The main area of ambiguity concerns the type of development that is expected to come forward. A

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

large number of consultees looked for more clarification about what is meant by major or large development in rural areas. The definition of large and small rural sites was provided in a footnote in the text. This definition relies on current policy wording contained in PPS3&7 and these definitions do not form part of the recently published NPPF. The revised policy should be clear about what it considered to be large rural sites and include this in the actual policy wording and not in the supporting text or as a footnote.

- 9.3 Many people highlighted ‘the sustainability trap’ where too much emphasis is placed on environmental protection at the cost of social and economic factors. Restrictive policies at smaller settlements need to include mechanisms where development linked to improvements can come forward without the use of a neighbourhood plan. The policy mechanism for large development at villages assumes the adoption of DPDs, whether Neighbourhood Plans or other planning mechanism. Major development at villages, especially that which provides new opportunities for employment or facilities, needs to have a mechanism in the core strategy as well as the preferred method of subsequent DPDs.
- 9.4 Another area of concern during the consultation was that at small settlements limited infill was overly restrictive and that settlements that did not fall into this category were not adequately provided for. The policies on exceptional or alternative development needed to provide stronger guidelines, especially when addressing community and employment generating uses that are welcome, to help sustain the rural communities at or near those facilities.
- 9.5 In appendix A the current policy and supporting text is set by settlement type. As part of this review, a complete analysis of the current policies in existing local plans has also been undertaken. This will ensure that the policies that are to be replaced have been taken into consideration.

### 10.0 Redrafting the Policy

- 10.1 The main focus in terms of this policy is to set out a structure by which the right development can take place in a timely manner. The nature of the development will vary depending on a number of factors based around, but not exclusive to, the scale and character of the settlement village and the environment and development in the immediate locality. The ideal approach would be for all major development to come forward through other DPDs. However, this is unlikely and a mechanism to bring forward unplanned “windfall” planning applications for major development also needs to exist.
- 10.2 Development should occur mainly within current settlement boundaries or the built-up area of villages and have regard to the size of the village and the general location of the site within the village structure. However, the ability of many of the villages to absorb new residential development within current settlement patterns may be limited for somewhat larger residential sites. At large villages and local service centres, where there is greater housing potential, new residential and employment development is envisaged to come forward outside of current settlements boundaries.
- 10.3 Infilling has traditionally been regarded as development of small sites in gaps in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage. The policy for small villages will continue to consider any residential proposals in such terms, but needs to better respond to the needs of small villages where infill sites are not available. This places a much larger emphasis on policy

wording to ensure that development does not impact on the character or quality of rural areas but still allows good developments at small villages.

10.4 There are a number of key aspects to framing a rural policy:

- Scale – As discussed above, the key aspect for rural policies is the issue of what size of development is acceptable. The core strategy will not prescribe the amount of development at each non-strategic settlement. The policy should then set out that the scale of development at each settlement will be proportional to the settlement, the surrounding development taking place and the environment and landscape within which that development sits. The idea of proportionality will be written into policy wording to enshrine a definition of the appropriate level of development for a settlement. The policy should also highlight the issues of incremental development and be explicit that this should be taken into consideration when assessing scale relevant to each individual settlement.
- Design – The character, appearance and distinctiveness of each settlement includes the historical heritage and built form of the settlement, and the setting and landscape character around that settlement. References to character, landscape and design should ensure that these aspects are enhanced by development. Where settlements are entirely washed over by national and local designations such as AONBs existing planning guidance should inform the design of each development
- Environment – The policy must respect the natural environment, maintenance of biodiversity, and protected resources and wildlife. The new policy will place an emphasis on the value of open space within existing settlements and again prescribe that development must enhance aspects of the environment. A focus on the idea of backland or tandem development will be an important part of ensuring that incremental development does not impinge on the environment
- Location - The distribution proposed in this policy should allow the small Wiltshire settlements the flexibility to meet the overall strategic requirements for rural areas and Core Strategy. Therefore, subsequent DPDs may seek to phase the development of any allocated sites within villages so that should windfall sites come forward, allocated sites will only come forward when required.

10.5 It is clear that the policy on rural settlements needs to include a substantial amount of detail. Currently the policy of the settlement strategy provides for some of the key aspects identified above, without offering a sufficient level of detail. There is a clear delineation between what the settlement strategy needs to achieve (i.e challenge SS1) and how this is then interpreted into policy itself (challenge SS2). In the wider consultation there was a general concern with the lack of policy on rural areas as this area of policy was seen as neglected. A decision has been taken to split the settlement strategy policy. The policy on the settlement strategy will deal with the identification of settlements and settlement boundaries and those issues that affect all settlements; and a rural development policy will focus specifically on all aspects of rural development.

10.6 The new policy will appear in the main policy part of the document and will include a number of other aspects of development, such as diversification and safeguarding rural facilities. The following text in the box below is what has been recommended to be added to the policy from the perspective of the settlement strategy:

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY – Development at non-strategic settlements and other rural locations**

At Local Service Centres and all villages development must be proportional to the scale of the existing settlement. All development will enhance the quality of the built and natural environment reflecting the character of the locality, with particular reference to the conservation of Wiltshire's historic and built heritage, the setting of landscapes and protection of resources and biodiversity.

Development at Local Service Centres and Large Villages will safeguard their role in delivering services, facilities and employment in rural areas. Where possible, development will consist predominantly of sites within current settlement boundaries. However, development well related to settlement boundaries that supports wider community aims and also delivers substantial affordable housing and/or employment, services and facilities will be supported.

At Small Villages limited development within the current envelope of the village that helps deliver affordable housing and/or employment, services and facilities will be supported provided that the development;

- respects the existing and distinctive spatial form of the settlement;
- does not elongate the village along transport corridors or impose development in sensitive landscape areas and/or consolidate an existing sporadic, loose knit area of development;

At all non-strategic settlements important open space and visual gaps should be retained and inappropriate backland or tandem development will not be supported. At settlements where there are a number of sites available the incremental effect of the combined size of these sites should be considered before development takes place.

**Exceptional Development**

In other rural locations replacement of existing dwellings and re-use or replacement of buildings for commercial or employment purposes will be supported where the development;

- meets the needs of the existing local community offering potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities;
- conserves an important part of Wiltshire's architectural heritage or a historic building;
- and, demonstrates that there are no locations with alternative transport options where the development could take place.

**Supporting Text**

*The level of development at Local Service Centres will be closely linked to their current and future role of providing for a significant rural hinterland. This will consist of significantly less development than that at the Principal Settlements and Market Towns. This will safeguard the role of these settlements and support the more rural communities of Wiltshire.*

*Development at Large Villages and Small Villages will meet the housing needs of the local community, and where possible safeguard the existing facilities and employment. At Large Villages development outside settlement boundaries should normally be adjacent to the villages apart from exceptional circumstances.*

*Major development is described as sites of 10 or more houses or xxx sqm of employment or commercial floorspace. Major development must ensure that there is adequate infrastructure for the needs of that site and future sites that maybe required to meet community needs. At Local Service Centres and Large Villages in accordance with the settlement strategy major development should provide for local employment opportunities, improved community facilities and/or affordable housing provision.*

*At Small Villages it is expected that small sites, 5 houses or less and xxx sqm of employment or commercial land, will be delivered. Major development will only be appropriate at Small Villages where it provides new employment and/or facilities alongside affordable housing.*

*The appropriate mechanisms for bringing forward major development at all settlements, especially those located outside current settlement boundaries, will be through a community led Neighbourhood Plan or Site Allocations Development Plan Document. However, major development may take place through applications that are supported by a robust Statement of Community Engagement and are explicitly supported by the appropriate elected local body.*

## **11.0 Challenge SS3 Settlement Boundaries**

11.1 The paragraph below dealt with settlement boundaries. However, they were also referred to a number of times in policy wording.

4.15 At the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages settlement boundaries, as defined by former District Local Plans, will be retained. At Small Villages and those not listed in the strategy, settlement boundaries will be removed. Settlement boundaries can be reviewed through community led Neighbourhood Plans where they come forward or a review through a subsequent DPD.

11.2 The general response in the consultation was mixed, while some parishes and villages wanted to retain their boundary, others were unsure/or expressed to not understanding how the new criteria based policies could be enforced effectively. It is proposed that at all settlements except small villages settlement boundaries are to be retained. While the to the consultation demonstrated that many felt that settlement boundaries are a successful planning tool - they offer protection for the natural environment and a definitive boundary within which development is acceptable - there are a number of issues with the boundaries as they exist.

11.3 Across all settlements in Wiltshire there are a number of generic issues;

- The boundaries that exist are not fit for purpose as development has occurred beyond the current boundary. The existing boundaries do not accurately reflect the current urban form of the settlement and there are numerous sustainable locations not within current boundaries that should be considered for development.
- National planning policy is clear (PPS3, PPS7) that development can take place in or adjacent to settlements. This will cause considerable pressure along settlement boundaries where an obvious extension to a settlement is proposed for development.
- The boundaries that exist were drawn under previous planning legislation and were not subject to same level of consultation or scrutiny that the LDF system or the emerging Localism Bill require in the creation of policy. This has led to boundaries not accurately reflecting the urban form of settlements.

11.4 However, despite these issues it is proposed that boundaries are retained. The rationale for this decision was based around the fact that at all settlements, except small villages, policies identify that it will be appropriate for these settlements to grow beyond their current boundaries. The existing boundary provides a useful point of reference and it is expected that this will be reviewed in a subsequent document. Once reviewed it would be expected that appropriate sites adjacent to settlements would be included within boundaries.

### **Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

11.5 At smaller settlements there was a further complication with settlement boundaries. There is an inconsistent approach across Wiltshire, due to policy being provided by saved policies from the four former district councils. The lack of boundaries at some of the smaller settlements is likely to lead to an inconsistent approach to development if the same policies are applied to settlements with or without settlement boundaries. It is considered that at smaller villages the amount of development proposed enables the use of criteria based policies that have been identified above

### **12.0 Wiltshire Core Strategy and South Wiltshire Core Strategy**

12.1 The approach to rural settlements in the two strategies is radically different. This simply reflects the context they were prepared in, before and after the abolition of regional spatial strategies. The new policies as designed do not fit the current structure of the South Wiltshire settlement strategy. Therefore to bring the strategies together a complete re-assessment of small settlements in South Wiltshire is needed to provide the right opportunities for development at rural settlements in line with policy proposals below and the separate rural development policy. The methodology of this assessment is set in on pages 7-15 in the original topic paper.

12.2 The policy wording for settlement strategy that will apply to all settlements across Wiltshire is below.

### **Core Policy 1 - Settlement strategy**

The fundamental principle of sustainable development revolves around ensuring that development is situated in the right location. The settlement strategy identifies the towns, cities and villages across Wiltshire where sustainable development will improve the lives of all those who live and work in Wiltshire

#### **Principal Settlements**

Wiltshire's Principal Settlements are strategically important centres and the primary focus for development. This will safeguard and enhance their strategic roles as employment and service centres.

They will provide significant levels of jobs and homes, together with supporting community facilities and infrastructure meeting their economic potential in the most sustainable way to support better self containment.

The Principal Settlements are: Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury.

#### **Market Towns**

Outside the Principal Settlements, Market Towns are defined as settlements that have the ability to support sustainable patterns of living in Wiltshire through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities.

Market Towns will be the focus of locally significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance their services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable sustainable communities.

The Market Towns are: Amesbury, Bradford-on-Avon, Calne, Corsham, Devizes, Malmesbury, Marlborough, Melksham, Tidworth and Ludgershall, Warminster, Westbury, and Wootton Bassett.

#### **Local Service Centres**

Local Service Centres are defined as smaller towns and larger villages which serve a surrounding rural hinterland and possess a level of facilities and services that, together with improved local employment, provide the best opportunities outside the Market Towns for greater self containment. Local Service Centres will provide for modest levels of development in order to safeguard their role and to deliver affordable housing.

#### **Large and Small Villages**

Large Villages are defined as settlements with a limited range of employment, services and facilities. Small Villages have a low level of services and facilities, and few employment opportunities.

Development at non-strategic settlements, the local service centres and villages, is set in CPxx (Rural Development Policy).

Development within, adjacent or well related to current settlement boundaries, except at small villages, that conforms to the community area strategies and/or CPxx (Rural Development Policy) and is of the correct scale, character and function, will be appropriate.

At settlements other than those identified in the hierarchy, new development will be restricted and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances set in CPxx (Rural Development Policy).

***Supporting Text***

*All of our Market Towns and Principal settlements have different strategic roles as part of our delivery strategy outlined in CP2. In the Community Area strategies the way we expect each settlement to develop is clarified. All development at the strategic settlements will contribute to individual Community Area strategies.*

*Categorisation of settlements within the strategy is clarified further within the Settlement Strategy Topic Paper and settlements defined as Local Service Centres and Large and Small Villages are named in the community area strategies.*

*At the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages settlement boundaries, as defined by former District Local Plans, will be retained. At Small Villages and those not listed in the strategy, settlement boundaries will be removed. Settlement boundaries can be reviewed through community led Neighbourhood Plans where they come forward or a review through a subsequent DPD.*

*Where proposals for improved local employment opportunities and/or new services and facilities at Small Villages arise through community led Neighbourhood Plans, such villages may be able to become more sustainable and their status change to that of 'Large Villages' as a result. Any change of status will need to be justified as part of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.*

## Appendix A – Settlement Types and Full Settlement Strategy

Appendix A lists the types of settlement that have been identified and provides a full list of settlements for Wiltshire. The appendix also includes some wording from the last Core Strategy Consultation Document for reference.

<b>Settlement Type</b>	<b>Policy Wording</b>	<b>Supporting Text</b>
Local Service Centres	Local Service Centres will provide for modest levels of development in order to safeguard their role and to deliver affordable housing. Development will consist predominantly of sites within current settlement boundaries. However, development well related to settlement boundaries that supports wider community aims, and is of the correct scale, character and function, will be appropriate.	The level of development at Local Service Centres will be closely linked to their current and future role of providing for a significant rural hinterland. This will consist of significantly less development than that at the Principal Settlements and Market Towns. Significant developments at Local Service Centres in accordance with the settlement strategy should provide for local employment opportunities, improved community facilities and/or affordable housing provision. This will safeguard the role of these settlements and support the more rural communities of Wiltshire.
Large Villages	The majority of development will take the form of small sites within existing settlement boundaries. Some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries.	Development at Large Villages will predominantly take place within existing settlement boundaries and take the form of small housing and employment sites. Some development adjacent to boundaries will be acceptable, as long as it has been identified through the appropriate mechanism (set out below) and developed in conjunction with the local community. Development at Large Villages will meet the housing needs of the local community, and where possible safeguard the existing facilities and employment.
Small villages	Development at these settlements will only consist of limited infill which does not: elongate the existing built form of the village causing any ribbon style development; or consolidate an existing sporadic, loose knit area of development.	Development at Small Villages will be limited to infill and will consist of new and replacement or redevelopment of small sites only. At Small Villages development of limited sites will help meet the housing needs of the existing local community and can offer potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities.
Non sustainable locations	At settlements other than those identified in the hierarchy, new development will be restricted and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.	

### Amesbury Community Area

Market Town: Amesbury

## **Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Large Village: Great Wishford, Porton, Shrewton, Tishead & The Winterbournes

Small Village: Allington, Berwick St James, Cholderrton, Figheldean/Ablington, Gomeldon, Great Durnford, Hanging Landford, Lower Woodford, Middle Woodford, Milston, Newton Tony, Orcheston, Stapleford, Steeple Langford, Winterbourne Stoke & Wylde

### **Bradford on Avon Community Area**

Market Town: Bradford-on-Avon

Larger Village: Holt, Westwood and Winsley.

Small Village: Limpley Stoke, Monkton Farleigh, Staverton & Wingfield.

### **Calne Community Area**

Market Town: Calne

Large Village: Derry Hill/Studley.

Small Village: Bremhill, Cherhill, Compton Bassett, Heddington and Hilmarton.

### **Chippenham Community Area**

Principal settlement: Chippenham

Large Village: Christian Malford, Hullavington, Kington St Michael, Sutton Benger and Yatton Keynell.

Small Village: Biddestone, Burton, Kington Langley, Langley Burrell, Lower Stanton St Quintin, Nettleton, Seagry & Stanton St Quintin.

### **Corsham Community Area**

Market Town: Corsham

Large Village: Colerne, Rudloe & Box.

Small Village: Gastard, Lacock, Neston & Westwells.

### **Devizes Community Area**

Market Town: Devizes

Local Service Centre: Market Lavington

Large Village: Bromham, Great Chevell, Potterne, Urchfont, West Lavington/ Littleton Pannell & Worton.

Small Village: All Cannings, Bishop Cannings, Easterton, Erlestoke, Etchilhampton, Marston & Rowde.

### **Malmesbury Community Area**

Market Town: Malmesbury

Large Village: Ashton Keynes, Crudwell, Great Somerford, Oaksey & Sherston.

Small Village: Brinkworth, Charlton, Corston, Dauntsey, Lea, Luckington, Milbourne, Minety & Upper Minety.

### **Marlborough Community Area**

Market Town: Marlborough

Large Village: Aldbourne, Baydon, Broad Hinton and Ramsbury.

Small Village: Avebury/ Trusloe, Axford, Beckhampton, Chilton Folliat, East Kennett, Froxfield, Fyfield, Lockeridge, Manton, Ogbourne St George, West Overton, Winterbourne Bassett & Winterbourne Monkton.

### **Melksham Community Area**

Market Town: Melksham

Large Village: Atworth, Seend, Semington, Shaw/Whitley & Steeple Ashton.

Small Villages: Beanacre, Berryfield, Broughton Gifford, Bulkington, Keevil, Poulshot & Seend Cleeve.

### **Mere Community Area**

## **Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Local Service Centre: Mere

Small Village: East Knoyle, Kilmington, Semley/Semley Station, Stourton & Zeals

### **Pewsey Community Area**

Local Service Centre: Pewsey

Large Village: Burbage, Great Bedwyn, Shalbourne and Upavon.

Small Village: Alton Priors/Alton Barnes, Charlton St Peter, Chirton, East Grafton, Easton Royal, Ham, Hilcott, Little Bedwyn, Manningford Bruce, Marden, Milton Lilbourne, Oare, Rushall, Stanton St Bernard, Wilcot, Woodborough, Wootton Rivers

### **Royal Wotton Bassett & Cricklade Community Area**

Market Town: Wootton Bassett

Local Service Centre: Cricklade

Large Village: Lyneham & Purton

Small Village: Bradenstoke, Broad Town, Hook, Latton, Lydiard Millicent & Purton Stoke.

### **Southern Wiltshire Community Area**

Local Service Centre: Downton

Large Village: Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Morgans Vale/Woodfalls, Pitton, Whiteparish & Winterslow/Middle Winterslow

Small Village: Bodenham, Britford, Charlton, East Grimstead, Farley, Firsdown/Winterbourne, Lopcombe Corner, Lover/Bohemia, Nomansland, Nunton, Odstock, Redlynch, West Dean & West Grimstead

### **Tidworth Community Area**

Market Town: Tidworth/Ludgershall

Large Village: Netheravon and Collingbourne Ducis.

Small Village: Collingbourne Kingston, Enford, Everleigh and The Chutes (Chute Standen/Cadley, Lower Chute & Upper Chute).

### **Tisbury Community Area**

Local Service Centre: Tisbury

Large Village: Fovant, Hindon & Ludwell

Small Village: Ansty, Berwick St John, Charlton, Chilmark, Donhead St Andrew, Donhead St Mary, Fonthill Bishop, Fonthill Gifford, Sutton Manderville, Swallowcliffe & Tollard Royal

### **Trowbridge Community Area**

Principal settlement: Trowbridge

Large Village: Hilperton, North Bradley & Southwick.

Small Village: Yarnbrook & West Ashton

### **Warminster Community Area**

Market Town: Warminster

Large Village: Chapmanslade, Codford, Corsley, Heytesbury & Sutton Veny.

Small Village: Chitterne, Crockerton, Horningsham, Longbridge Deverill, Maiden Bradley & Stockton.

### **Westbury Community Area**

Market Town: Westbury

Large Village: Dilton Marsh and Bratton.

Small Village: Edington/Tinhead

**Wilton Community Area**

Local Service Centre: Wilton

Large Village: Broadchalke & Dinton

Small Village: Barford St Martin, Bishopstone, Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore), Compton Chamberlayne, Ebbesbourne Wake, Quidhampton, South Newton, Stoford & Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias

In addition to the wording and supporting text included in the main part of the addendum the following supporting text was included.

4.13 At Local Service Centres and Large and Small Villages development must be in character with the scale and appearance of the settlement, and will need to take account of a number of other factors. These include the maintenance or enhancement of environmental quality, due consideration to landscape, local design statements and affordable housing need.

4.14 The appropriate mechanisms for bringing forward larger developments within settlements will generally be through applications that are supported by a robust Statement of Community Engagement. However, where development is well related to but outside of settlement boundaries the appropriate mechanism will be through a community led Neighbourhood Plan or Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

## Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

### Appendix B – South Wiltshire Settlements

The details and methodology of this appendix can be found in the original Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy on pages 7 – 15. Each of the tables has all of the South Wiltshire settlements that have been reassessed listed alphabetically.

#### Basic Analysis

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Food Shop	Post Office	Primary School	Place of Worship or Village Hall	Current Planning Status	Score
Allington	Amesbury	280				☐	HPB	
Alvediston	Wilton	30				☐		
Amesbury (Countess Road)	Amesbury							
Ansty	Tisbury	60	☐			☐	H20	
Barkers Hill (Semley)	Tisbury	40**					H19	
Berwick St James	Amesbury	170				☐	HPB	
Berwick St John	Tisbury	220				☐	HPB	
Berwick St Leonard	Tisbury	60						
Bishopstone	Wilton	490				☐	HPB	
Boscombe	Amesbury	90					HPB	
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton	280	☐				HPB	
Burcombe	Wilton	140	☐			☐	HPB	
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire	160				☐	HPB	
Charlton	Tisbury	100				☐	HPB	
Chicklade	Tisbury	50					H19	
Chicks Grove/Sutton Row	Tisbury	70**					H19	
Cholderton	Amesbury	170	☐			☐	H19	
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton	70				☐	H19	
Deptford	Amesbury	50**					HPB	
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury	230	☐			☐	HPB	
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury	210	☐			☐	H19	
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	160				☐	H19	

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Food Shop	Post Office	Primary School	Place of Worship or Village Hall	Current Planning Status	Score
East Knoyle	Mere	360	?	?		?	HPB	
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton	130	?			?	H19	
Farley	Southern Wiltshire	290				?	HPB	
Firsdow/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire	550	?				HPB	
Fisherton De La Mere	Amesbury	40**					H20	
Fonthill Bishop	Tisbury	100		?		?	H19	
Fonthill Gifford	Tisbury	100				?	H19	
Ford	Southern Wiltshire	410					HPB	
Great Durnford	Amesbury	180				?	HPB	
Hamptworth	Southern Wiltshire	70					HA2	
Hanging Landford	Amesbury	190				?	HPB	
Homington	Southern Wiltshire	130					HPB	
Hugglers Hole/Sedgehill	Mere	30					HPB	
Hurdcott	Amesbury	90**					HPB	
Idmiston	Amesbury	350					HPB	
Kilmington	Mere	180			?	?	HPB	
Lake	Amesbury	70					H19	
Landford	Southern Wiltshire	500	?	?	?	?	HA2	
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire	100			?		H19	
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire	370				?	HA2	
Lower Woodford	Amesbury	100	?		?		H19	
Milston	Amesbury	130			?	?	HPB	
Netherhampton	Wilton	1041			?		H20	
Newton / Pythouse	Tisbury	100					H19	
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire	520	?		?	?		

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Food Shop	Post Office	Primary School	Place of Worship or Village Hall	Current Planning Status	Score
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire	220			?	?	HPB	Yellow
Petersfinger	Southern Wiltshire	40					HPB	Red
Quidhampton	Wilton	380			?		HPB	Yellow
Redlynch	Southern Wiltshire	400	?			?	H19	Yellow
Semley	Mere	470			?	?	HPB	Yellow
South Newton	Wilton	460	?		?	?	HPB	Green
Stoford	Wilton	160			?	?	HPB	Yellow
Stourton	Mere	60				?	H20	Yellow
Stratford Tony	Wilton	40						Red
Sutton Mandeville	Tisbury	60				?	H19	Yellow
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury	100				?	H19	Yellow
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton	300	?			?	H19	Yellow
Tollard Royal	Tisbury	80			?		H19	Yellow
Upper Woodford	Amesbury	160					HPB	Red
West Dean	Southern Wiltshire	250				?	H19	Yellow
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	300				?	HPB	Yellow
West Knoyle	Mere	100					HPB	Red
White Cross (Zeals)	Mere	50**					H19	Red
Wilsford	Amesbury	60			?		HPB	Yellow
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury	150			?	?	HPB	Yellow

**Population and Employment**

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Population Group	Employed residents	No of jobs in Village	No residents who live and work in Village	Self Containment	Scoring
Allington	Amesbury	280	Medium	152	48	42	28%	
Ansty	Tisbury	60	Small	51	42	27	53%	
Berwick St James	Amesbury	170	Small	86	34	25	29%	
Berwick St John	Tisbury	220	Medium	70	64	10	14%	
Bishopstone	Wilton	490	Medium	184	229	76	41%	
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton	280	Medium					
Burcombe	Wilton	140	Small	80	41	32	40%	
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire	160	Small	137	134	92	67%	
Charlton	Tisbury	100	Small	80	68	59	74%	
Cholderton	Amesbury	170	Small	75	61	25	33%	
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton	70	Small	38	38	20	53%	
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury	230	Small	106	73	64	60%	
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury	210	Small	56	50	41	73%	
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	160	Small	87	62	38	44%	
East Knoyle	Mere	360	Medium	125	102	58	46%	
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton	130	Small	94	53	32	34%	
Farley	Southern Wiltshire	290	Medium	72	74	41	57%	
Firsdow/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire	550	Medium	244	71	59	24%	
Fonthill Bishop	Tisbury	100	Small	45	37	25	56%	
Fonthill Gifford	Tisbury	100	Small	45	37	25	56%	
Great Durnford	Amesbury	180	Small	144	696	81	56%	
Hanging Landford	Amesbury	190	Small	123	69	45	37%	

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Population Group	Employed residents	No of jobs in Village	No residents who live and work in Village	Self Containment	Scoring
Kilmington	Mere	180	Small	107	77	71	66%	
Landford	Southern Wiltshire	500	Medium	187	143	100	53%	
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire	100	Small	159	127	88	55%	
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire	370	Medium	228	159	102	45%	
Lower Woodford	Amesbury	100	Small					
Milston	Amesbury	130	Small	48	9	9	19%	
Netherhampton	Wilton	1041	Small	49	405	28	57%	
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire	520	Medium	134	106	82	61%	
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire	220	Small					
Quidhampton	Wilton	380	Medium	172	46	46	27%	
Redlynch	Southern Wiltshire	400	Medium	121	48	39	32%	
Semley	Mere	470	Medium	116	119	77	66%	
South Newton	Wilton	460	Medium	129	155	30	23%	
Stoford	Wilton	160	Small	159	183	51	32%	
Stourton	Mere	60	Small	73	82	52	71%	
Sutton Manderville	Tisbury	60	Small	67	73	48	70%	
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury	100	Small	46	34	28	61%	
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton	300	Medium	100	144	54	54%	
Tollard Royal	Tisbury	80	Small	28	22	19	68%	
West Dean	Southern	250	Medium	83	78	39	47%	

### Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Population	Population Group	Employed residents	No of jobs in Village	No residents who live and work in Village	Self Containment	Scoring
	Wiltshire							
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	300	Medium	110	40	34	31%	
Wilsford	Amesbury	60	Small	39	84	33	85%	
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury	150	Small					

### Transport and Communications

Settlement	Community Area	Journey To Work Service	Daily Bus Service	Community Transport			Highway Capacity	Potential Broadband Speed, Mbps	Average Mobile Signal	Scoring
				Link Scheme	Community Minibus	Demand Responsive				
Allington	Amesbury	None	Yes	?		?	2.5	2.2		
Ansty	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?			3	2		
Berwick St James	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?	3.5	2		
Berwick St John	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?			3.5	1.6		
Bishopstone	Wilton	Level 2	Yes	?			2.5	1.6		
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton	None	Yes	?			3.5	1.4		
Burcombe	Wilton	Level 1	Yes	?			4.5	0.9		
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire	Level 1	Yes	?			1	0.2		
Charlton	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?	3.5	1.8		
Cholderton	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?	6.5	2.2		
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton	Level 2	Yes	?				2		
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?			5	1.8		
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?	4	1.8		

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Journey To Work Service	Daily Bus Service	Community Transport			Highway Capacity	Potential Broadband Speed, Mbps	Average Mobile Signal	Scoring
				Link Scheme	Community Minibus	Demand Responsive				
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?				5	1	
East Knoyle	Mere	None	Yes	?		?		6.5	1.3	
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton	None	Yes	?				0.5	1.4	
Farley	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?				6.5	1.3	
Firsdow/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire	Level 1	Yes	?				2	0.4	
Fonthill Bishop	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?					1.8	
Fonthill Gifford	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?				4.5	1.8	
Great Durnford	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?		4	1.6	
Hanging Landford	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?	?			2	2	
Kilmington	Mere	None	Yes	?		?		0.5	0.1	
Landford	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?				6.5	1.3	
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?					2	
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?				3.5	0.7	
Lower Woodford	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?			2.2	
Milston	Amesbury	Level 1	Yes	?	?	?			2.2	
Netherhampton	Wilton	Level 1	Yes	?	?			5	2.6	
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?				4	0.8	
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire	Level 1	Yes	?					2.2	
Quidhampton	Wilton	Level 1	Yes	?	?			4.5	2.6	
Redlynch	Southern	Level 2	Yes	?				5	1	

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Settlement	Community Area	Journey To Work Service	Daily Bus Service	Community Transport			Highway Capacity	Potential Broadband Speed, Mbps	Average Mobile Signal	Scoring
				Link Scheme	Community Minibus	Demand Responsive				
	Wiltshire									
Semley	Mere	None	Yes	?		?			1.8	
South Newton	Wilton	Level 1	Yes	?	?			1.5	2.2	
Stoford	Wilton	Level 1	Yes	?	?			5	2.2	
Stourton	Mere	None	Yes	?		?		2	1.8	
Sutton Manderville	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?			1.8	
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury	Level 2	Yes	?					2	
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton	Level 2	Yes	?				6.5	2	
Tollard Royal	Tisbury	None	No						1.2	
West Dean	Southern Wiltshire	Level 2	Yes	?					1.6	
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	Level 1	Yes	?				5	1	
Wilsford	Amesbury	None	No	?		?			2	
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury	Level 2	Yes	?		?		1.5	2	

**Leisure, Recreation & Other Facilities**

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Recreation Field	Children's Play Area	Sports Pitches (Indoor & Outdoor)	Sports/Social Club	Public Houses	Mobile Library	Petrol Station	GP	Scoring
Allington	Amesbury	0	1	1	2	1				
Ansty	Tisbury	0	0	0	1	0	?			
Berwick St James	Amesbury	0	1	1	1	1	?			
Berwick St John	Tisbury	1	1	2	5	1				
Bishopstone	Wilton	1	1	2	3	1	?			
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton	0	0	0	3	0				
Burcombe	Wilton	0	0	0	1	1				
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire	1	1	2	0	0	?			
Charlton	Tisbury	1	1	2	4	0	?			
Cholderton	Amesbury	1	0	1	2	1				
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton	0	0	0	3	0				
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury	0	0	0	0	1	?			
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury	0	0	0	3	1		?		
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	0	0	0	3	0	?			
East Knoyle	Mere	1	1	2	0	2	?			
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton	0	1	1	0	1				
Farley	Southern Wiltshire	0	1	1	6	1	?			
Firsdown/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire	0	1	1	0	0	?			
Fonthill Bishop	Tisbury	0	0	0	3	0				
Fonthill Gifford	Tisbury	0	1	1	1	1				
Great Durnford	Amesbury	0	0	0	1	1				
Hanging Landford	Amesbury	0	0	0	2	0	?			
Kilmington	Mere	1	1	2	0	0	?			
Landford	Southern Wiltshire	1	2	3	13	1	?	?		

### Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Recreation Field	Children's Play Area	Sports Pitches (Indoor & Outdoor)	Sports/Social Club	Public Houses	Mobile Library	Petrol Station	GP	Scoring
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire	0	0	0	0	0				
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire	1	1	2	0	0	?			
Lower Woodford	Amesbury	0	0	0	1	1	?			
Milston	Amesbury	0	0	0	2	0				
Netherhampton	Wilton	0	0	4	0	1				
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire	0	1	1	8	1	?			
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire	0	1	1	1	1				
Quidhampton	Wilton	0	1	0	4	1				
Redlynch	Southern Wiltshire	0	0	0	0	1	?			
Semley	Mere	0	0	0	0	1	?			
South Newton	Wilton	1	1	2	0	1	?			
Stoford	Wilton	1	0	1	0	1				
Stourton	Mere	0	0	0	1	1				
Sutton Manderville	Tisbury	0	0	0	2	1				
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury	0	0	0	3	0	?			
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton	0	1	1	3	0	?			
Tollard Royal	Tisbury	0	0	0	0	0	?			
West Dean	Southern Wiltshire	1	1	2	5	0	?			
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	0	1	1	0	0	?			
Wilsford	Amesbury	0	0	0	0	0				
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury	0	1	1	0	1		?		

### Deliverable Land & Constraints

Settlement	Community	Dwelling	Completo	Commitmen	Growth as	No of	No of	Total Area	Other Constraints	Scorin
------------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------	-------	-------	------------	-------------------	--------

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

	Area	ns	ns since 2006	ts	% of total households	Sites in the SHLAA	Sites Identified as Suitable & Available	Sites Considered Suitable & Available	Greenbelt	AONB	Flood Zone	Wildlife Site	g
Allington	Amesbury	120	0	0	0%	2	1	1.47ha			?		
Ansty	Tisbury	18	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Berwick St James	Amesbury	71	1	0	1%	2	1	3.69			?	?	
Berwick St John	Tisbury	96	1	1	2%	0	0			?			
Bishopstone	Wilton	152	0	3	2%	3	0						
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton	117	3	1	3%	0	0						
Burcombe	Wilton	48	0	0	0%	1	1	0.32ha					
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire	64	2	0	3%	2	2	0.61ha					
Charlton	Tisbury	29	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Cholderton	Amesbury	75	2	0	3%	3	0				?		
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton	30	0	0	0%	2	0						
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury	46	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury	53	0	1	2%	0	0			?			
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	54	5	1	11%	1	0						
East Knoyle	Mere	141	1	0	1%	1	1	1.63ha		?			
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton	42	1	0	2%	2	1	0.29ha					
Farley	Southern Wiltshire	93	3	1	4%	3	2	0.58ha					

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Dwellings	Completions since 2006	Commitments	Growth as % of total households	No of Sites in the SHLAA	No of Sites Identified as Suitable & Available	Total Area Sites Considered Suitable & Available	Other Constraints				Scoring
									Greenbelt	AON B	Flood Zone	Wildlife Site	
Firsdow/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire	245	4	0	2%	2	0				?	?	
Fonhill Bishop	Tisbury	43	0	4	9%	0	0			?			
Fonhill Gifford	Tisbury	28	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Great Durnford	Amesbury	62	2	6	13%	0	0				?	?	
Hanging Landford	Amesbury	88	8	0	9%	1	0			?	?	?	
Kilmington	Mere	22	5	0	23%	1	0			?			
Landford	Southern Wiltshire	167	0	1	1%	0	0						
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire	24	0	0	0%	0	0						
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire	146	0	0	0%	0	0						
Lower Woodford	Amesbury	35	0	2	6%	1	0				?	?	
Milston	Amesbury	39	0	0	0%	0	0				?	?	
Netherhampton	Wilton	193	1	0	1%	0	0						
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire	267	11	7	7%	0	0						
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire	105	0	0	0%	1	1	1.36ha					
Quidhampton	Wilton	186	10	0	5%	0	0						

### Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Dwellings	Completions since 2006	Commitments	Growth as % of total households	No of Sites in the SHLAA	No of Sites Identified as Suitable & Available	Total Area Sites Considered Suitable & Available	Other Constraints				Scoring
									Greenbelt	AONB	Flood Zone	Wildlife Site	
Redlynch	Southern Wiltshire	162	3	1	2%	0	0						
Semley	Mere	39	1	-1	0%	0	0			?			
South Newton	Wilton	199	18	0	9%	0	0						
Stoford	Wilton	76	3	1	5%	0	0						
Stourton	Mere	21	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Sutton Manderville	Tisbury	24	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury	36	0	0	0%	1	0			?			
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton	98	3	2	5%	1	0						
Tollard Royal	Tisbury	16	0	0	0%	0	0			?			
West Dean	Southern Wiltshire	47	-1	1	0%	0	0						
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire	117	1	1	2%	3	0						
Wilsford	Amesbury	17	0	0	0%	0	0				?	?	
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury	72	5	0	7%	1	0				?	?	

### Overall Results and Classification

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Community Area	Basic Analysis	Population & Employment	Transport & Communications	Leisure, Recreation & Other Facilities	Deliverable Land & Constraints	Classification
Allington	Amesbury						Small Village
Ansty	Tisbury						Small Village
Berwick St James	Amesbury						Small Village
Berwick St John	Tisbury						Small Village
Bishopstone	Wilton						Small Village
Bowerchalke (incl. Misselfore)	Wilton						Small Village
Burcombe	Wilton						Small Village
Charlton All Saints	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Charlton	Tisbury						Small Village
Cholderton	Amesbury						Small Village
Compton Chamberlayne	Wilton						Small Village
Donhead St Andrew	Tisbury						Small Village
Donhead St Mary	Tisbury						Small Village
East Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
East Knoyle	Mere						Small Village
Ebbesbourne Wake	Wilton						Small Village
Farley	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Firsdow/Winterbourne Down	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Fonthill Bishop	Tisbury						Small Village
Fonthill Gifford	Tisbury						Small Village
Great Durnford	Amesbury						Small Village
Hanging Landford	Amesbury						Small Village
Kilmington	Mere						Small Village
Landford	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village

**Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum**

Settlement	Community Area	Basic Analysis	Population & Employment	Transport & Communications	Leisure, Recreation & Other Facilities	Deliverable Land & Constraints	Classification
Lopcombe Corner	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Lover / Bohemia	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Lower Woodford	Amesbury						Small Village
Milston	Amesbury						Small Village
Netherhampton	Wilton						Small Village
Nomansland	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Nunton	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Quidhampton	Wilton						Small Village
Redlynch	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Semley	Mere						Small Village
Shrewton	Amesbury						Small Village
Stoford	Wilton						Small Village
Stourton	Mere						Small Village
Sutton Manderville	Tisbury						Small Village
Swallowcliffe	Tisbury						Small Village
Teffont Magna and Teffont Evias	Wilton						Small Village
Tollard Royal	Tisbury						Small Village
West Dean	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
West Grimstead	Southern Wiltshire						Small Village
Wilsford	Amesbury						None
Winterbourne Stoke	Amesbury						Small Village

**Appendix C – Settlement Strategy**

Appendix C lists the changes in the settlement strategy that has been made and explains why the changes have been made.

Settlement	Consultee Comment	Officer Comments and Assessment	Status
Alderton	Mentioned as a possible small settlements in a response.	No new information included in response, no change in assessment.	no status
Beanacre	Beanacre should be identified as a small village.	Mistake was identified as a small village. Corrected	Small Village
Berryfield	Berryfield should be identified as a small village	<p>Berryfield has in the past been considered part of a functional urban area that includes Bowerhill and Melksham. This is largely due to the proximity of the Hampton Business Park which also serves as an employment location for Melksham and Bowerhill. However, despite the village being physically connected to industrial area it does include its own distinct physical form. Although residents of Berryfield rely on Melksham and Bowerhill for the majority of their employment and services there is no interrelationship. In this way Melksham and Bowerhill could function independently of Berryfield and they do not rely on the village to function. Berryfield therefore has reason to be considered an independent settlement in the same way that any other lower order rural settlement has been considered in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Berryfield itself does not have many services or facilities and although there is some evidence of deliverable sites and a lack of constraints in terms of development. Nevertheless when carrying out and an assessment of Berryfield it is clear that the if it is considered a settlement in its own right then it should be a small village</p>	Small Village

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Consultee Comment	Officer Comments and Assessment	Status
Bowerhill	Bowerhill should be identified as a large village or local service centre, and Beanacre and Berryfield should be identified as small villages.	<p>Melksham and Bowerhill are considered as one single settlement, although it is acknowledged that they are separated by the important green spaces and Bowerhill does form its own distinct urban area. However, in practical terms, they should be planned for as a single entity. The Bowerhill industrial estate was formed and has been developed to serve Melksham and Bowerhill. This relationship is highlighted by the relative commuting patterns where a high % of the population of Melksham commute to Bowerhill and higher % of Bowerhill's population work in either Bowerhill or Melksham. The new secondary school for Melksham has been located in Bowerhill and further enhances the functional relationship between these two settlements. It is due to this relationship that Bowerhill does not contain the services or facilities you might expect for a settlement with similar population.</p> <p>Bowerhill does possess a primary school, a church, some comparison goods stores, a number of public houses, and a petrol filling station (which sells a limited range of food) but residents are likely to rely on the supermarkets and other convenience stores, doctors' surgeries and pharmacists and leisure facilities in Melksham. If Bowerhill were located at some distance from Melksham, it would function more independently as a small town or village. However, due to its proximity to Melksham, and their shared facilities it cannot be considered in isolation. It is important to plan for Melksham and Bowerhill as a single unit as they already operate effectively as one functional urban area. Joint planning for both settlements will help to prevent coalescence between the two and enable Bowerhill to maintain its individual character, which is an important aim of the local residents.</p>	Considered as functional grouping with Melksham
Burton	Mentioned as a possible small settlements in a response.	No new information included in response, no change in assessment.	No Status

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Consultee Comment	Officer Comments and Assessment	Status
Chapmanslade		Amended in previous version at last minute due to consultation response to Wiltshire 2026 document.	Large Village
Everleigh	Everleigh should be added to the list of small villages in the Tidworth Area.	Assessment of Everleigh shows that it does have a number of other facilities, including a meeting place (part of the basic facilities), that were not included in the assessment of the village. A re-assessment shows that it should be classified as a Small Village	Small Village
Hilperton	Consideration is needed to identify the most appropriate approach to protecting the separate identity of Hilperton.	<p>Hilperton has in the past been considered part of a functional urban area of Trowbridge. This is due to the continuous urban of the two settlements and the extensive development along the canal road, at Staverton Marina and Paxcroft Mead. However, despite the village being physically connected it does retain a distinct physical form particularly around the old part of the village. The current settlement limits of Hilperton are expanded to include the Paxcroft Mead development, however it is debatable whether. Although the majority of Hilperton residents will rely on the services of Trowbridge, as with Berryfield there is no interrelationship. For this reason Hilperton is being considered an independent settlement in the same way that any other lower order rural settlements has been considered in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Hilperton has a sizeable population, a number of services and facilities. It also has good communications, transport and has a number of deliverable sites with a lack of constraints in terms of development. In using the defined methodology set in the original topic paper Hilperton is considered a large village.</p>	Large Village
Huish	Mentioned as a possible small settlements in a response.	No new information included in response, no change in assessment.	No Status

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Consultee Comment	Officer Comments and Assessment	Status
Keevil	Comments explained that information for Keevil is incorrect. It does not contain	After updating the information used to assess Keevil it would be classified as a small village.	Small Village
Littleton Drew	Mentioned as a possible small settlements in a response.	No new information included in response, no change in assessment.	No Status
Lydiard Millicent	Lydiard Millicent should be defined as a small, NOT large village.	New information about Lydiard Millicent has indicated that it does score less well in some indicators. The decision has been taken to amend the status of the village to become a small village. Lydiard Millicent is situated on the edge of Swindon, although there remains a strategic gap between the settlements. Development encouraging close to Lydiard Millicent, including part of the west of Swindon development, are threatening the integrity of the village. To better protect Lydiard Millicent from this development pressure and to ensure the settlement retains both its individual identity and a visual gap from Swindon a designation as a small village is deemed appropriate. This is endorsed by the Parish Council and the local councillor.	Small Village
Minety and Upper Minety	Should be jointly designated as a Large Village.	The comments that suggested the amalgamation for these villages were from one landowner/developer. The Parish Council have not suggested this in their response and without their support no changes will be made.	Current status to remain
Oaksey	Reassess role of Oaksey as part of the spatial strategy work stream.	Detailed assessment of Oaksey has included some discussion with Parish Council regarding the status of the village. Although Oaksey does have a relatively small population when compared to other settlements that have been designated as a large village it performs very well in terms of the assessment and it is thought appropriate that the designation should remain the same. It should also be noted that some of the specific concerns of the Parish Council should not materialise as part of this policy for large villages.	Large Village

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Settlement	Consultee Comment	Officer Comments and Assessment	Status
Rudloe	Given the location of Rudloe and the likely developments near to the village, Rudloe should be classified as a large village not a small village.	The assessment of Rudloe shows that it should have been classified as a large village. In respect of the comment it is also felt appropriate that give the context of Rudloe large village status will help to ensure the re-use of MoD sites around Rudloe and Corsham will develop sustainably and be of benefit to the existing community by integrating properly with the existing settlement.	Large Village
Shaw and Whitley	Shaw and Whitley are linked with shared facilities and should be considered together. Taken together they should be in the large village category	As indicated in the main topic paper there are a number of villages where clustering or amalgamating to operate as a single village may be of significant advantage to those settlements. As it has been indicated by the Parish Council that for Shaw and Whitley they feel the settlements act as a single entity and that they are linked in terms of their urban area means it is appropriate to list these settlements as a single entity or clustered settlement.	Amalgamates to one large village
Sopworth	Mentioned as a possible small settlements in a response.	No new information included in response, no change in assessment.	No Status
Sutton Veny		Amended in previous version at last minute due to consultation response to Wiltshire 2026 document.	Large Village
West Ashton	Comments explained that information for West Ashton is incorrect. It does not contain	After updating the information used to assess West Ashton it would be classified as a small village.	Small Village

**Appendix D – Assessment of Saved Local Plan Policies**

Appendix D has a list of policies from saved local plans that have been considered as been considered as part of the process in formulating the new settlement strategy policies.

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<b>Kennet Local Plan</b>				
<p><b>HC22 Villages with a Range of Facilities</b>                      With the exception of Avebury, planning permission for limited additional housing development consisting of infilling, the replacement of existing dwellings, the reuse of existing buildings, the redevelopment of existing buildings or small groups of houses will be granted within the defined Limits of Development of those villages listed in Table H.4 provided that the development is in harmony with the village in terms of its scale and character.</p>	<p>Defines type of development that is acceptable within the limits of the listed villages. Essentially development will be acceptable in principle within the policy limit</p>	<p>Development of additional houses is described as limited and small groups. The thrust of the policy is redevelopment and replacement.</p>	<p>The word limited additional is restrictive and this generally applies to larger villages in this rural part of Wiltshire. As stated the policy does not provide a mechanism for new housing and focuses on redevelopment and minimum change.</p>	<p>Replaced as out-of-date/Potential save for settlement boundaries.</p>
<p><b>HC23 Housing in Avebury</b>                      Planning permission for limited additional housing development consisting of infilling, the replacement of existing dwellings or the re-use of existing buildings, or the redevelopment of existing buildings will be granted within the defined Limits of Development for Avebury providing that:                      a) the development is in harmony with the village in terms of its scale and character and conforms with architectural, environmental and other characteristics of the area;  <i>and</i>                      b) it is not within the Scheduled Ancient Monument comprising the henge monument and does not adversely affect any nationally important or locally</p>	<p>A specific policy that defines what is acceptable within the limits of development in Avebury.</p>	<p>Policy highlights the architectural importance of Avebury village and the Ancient Monument.</p>	<p>This policy is completely focused on Avebury. It is questionable whether this policy is the responsibility of settlement strategy at all or whether it falls under the historic environment.</p>	<p>Replaced in terms of settlement strategy. Aspects may need to be retained in terms of historic environment.</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>significant archaeological site.</p> <p>All new housing proposals should conform with other policies of the plan, including those that seek to protect local services (ED29), amenity (PD1) and employment or tourism uses (ED12, ED13) and promote affordable housing (HC32).</p>				
<p><b>HC24 Villages with Limited Facilities</b>                      Within the villages in the countryside listed in Table H.5, which do not have defined Limits of Development, new housing development will be restricted to infilling, the replacement of existing dwellings or the re-use of existing buildings or the redevelopment of existing buildings provided that the development:                      a) is within the existing built up area of the village;                      b) does not consolidate an existing sporadic, loose knit area of development; <i>and</i>                      c) the development is in harmony with the village in terms of its scale and character.</p>	<p>List villages where there are no settlement boundaries but development at those villages is based on the criteria in this policy.</p>	<p>Policy limits housing development to infilling and replacement/reuse. A short criteria is provided.</p>	<p>This is a restrictive policy but concerns much smaller settlements. This policy has proved successful in Kennet for settlements without settlement boundaries and restricts these settlements to limited infill. Key wording includes not consolidating sporadic, loose knit areas. The ideas of existing built up area and harmony, scale and character are also important. And well established</p>	<p>Replace</p>
<p><b>North Wiltshire Local Plan</b></p>				
<p><b>H3 Residential Development within Framework Boundaries</b>                      Proposals for residential development, including residential institutions and applications to renew permissions for residential development, within the Framework Boundaries as defined on the proposals</p>	<p>Defines type of development that is acceptable within the limits of the listed villages.</p>	<p>Introduces minimum density requirements. Restricts most villages to small scale development.</p>	<p>Restricts all settlements to development within boundaries, most villages to small scale other than a number of named settlements. Sets minimum</p>	<p>Replace</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
map, will be permitted, provided that: i) Priority is given to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings. ii) The proposal is for small scale or limited development in all villages except Calne, Chippenham, Corsham, Cricklade, Malmesbury, Wootton Bassett, Purton, Lyneham and Sherston. and iii) The most efficient use of the land is achieved compatible with the site location, its accessibility and its surroundings. A minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare will be sought. In the towns, higher densities may be appropriate.			density and priority to re-use of PDL which are likely to be covered in the delivery policy CP2.	
<b>H4 Residential development in the Open Countryside</b> New Dwellings in the Countryside outside the Framework Boundaries, as defined on the proposals map, will be permitted provided that: i) It is in connection with the essential needs of agriculture or forestry or other rural based enterprise; ii) It is a replacement for an existing dwelling where: a. The residential use has not been abandoned; and b. the existing dwelling is incapable of retention in its current state, is unsightly or is out of character with its surroundings and c. the replacement dwelling is of a similar size and scale to the existing dwelling within the same curtilage.	Policy sets out type of housing that will be appropriate outside of settlement boundaries and includes a list of criteria.	Development must be in-character and within the same curtilage.	Simple criteria for replacement dwellings in the countryside consists of agriculture, forestry or rural enterprise and replacement/re-use.	Replace – Should be covered by exceptions and nature environment policies.
<b>South Wiltshire Core Strategy Saved Policies</b>				
<b>Policy H 16</b>	Sets out criteria for	Only small scale	A policy that is focused on	Replace/Potential

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>In addition to the areas specified in policies H2-HI8, and except as provided by policies H17-H18, infilling, small scale development and redevelopment will be permitted within the Housing Policy Boundaries of: The policy will be subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(I) the proposal will not constitute tandem or inappropriate backland development;</li> <li>(ii) the proposal will not result in the loss of an open area which makes a positive contribution towards the character of the settlement; and</li> <li>(iii) in Wilton, the proposal will not exacerbate current problems associated with sewage disposal.</li> <li>(iv) the proposal will not conflict with the Design Policies of the Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>development within settlement boundaries</p>	<p>development will be allowed within HPBs. Also highlights the issue of backland and loss of open space.</p>	<p>design it limits new development to ‘small scale’ and in filling. The use of backland, character and highlighting of important open space all form part of a strong design led policy. The policy is reliant on HPBs to control development</p>	<p>save for settlement boundaries</p>
<p><b>Policy H17</b> Development will not be permitted in those areas within Housing Policy Boundaries which are indicated as Important Open Spaces, if it would erode the visual quality of the open space and/or would detrimentally affect the character of the settlement.</p>	<p>Specifies that important open spaces and their visual amenity will be protected.</p>	<p>Direct policy that puts a boundary around important areas of open space.</p>	<p>A supplementary policy concerned solely with open space. Should be dealt with by green infrastructure/landscape. Potentially needs to be mentioned as part of infilling policy if housing boundaries are removed.</p>	<p>Saved no need to remove these designations in term of the settlement strategy.</p>
<p><b>Policy H18</b> Development will not be permitted on areas within Housing Policy Boundaries which are formally laid out as amenity open space.</p>	<p>Specifies that formally laid out open space within boundaries will be protected.</p>	<p>As above with classification of amenity space.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Saved.</p>
<p><b>Policy H19</b> Within the Housing Restraint Areas defined on the Proposals Map and listed below, residential</p>	<p>Defines a series of areas where development is limited</p>	<p>HRAs are subject to extensions or conversions of single</p>	<p>These areas have been designated due to their high conservation or design</p>	<p>Saved. These areas are subject to extended</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>development, comprising the extension of an existing dwelling, the conversion of a single dwelling to form two or more units, or the erection of a new dwelling, will be acceptable only if the following criteria are met:</p> <p>(i) there will be no adverse impact on the character of the settlement or neighbourhood designated as a Housing Restraint Area;</p> <p>(ii) there is no loss of an important open space which contributes to the special character of the area;</p> <p>(iii) the loss of features such as trees, hedges and walls, which contribute to the character of the area, is kept to a minimum; and</p> <p>(iv) the development will be in keeping with the character of the neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>to single dwellings or conversion of single dwelling into two dwellings. It also lists a number of criteria for this development.</p>	<p>dwellings. Criteria are heavily based around design and character.</p>	<p>value. This policy does not directly affect the spatial strategy and is concerned with conservation. For the purposes of this review there are no changes proposed to this policy</p>	<p>levels of protection which provides supplementary protection to overall policies</p>
<p><b>Policy H20</b> New residential development will not be permitted where it would mar the outstanding appearance of the Special Restraint Areas of: Ablington Bodenham Stourton Policy H21 Ansty Fisherton de la Mere Teffont Evias</p>	<p>Defines a series of Special Restraint Areas where no new residential development will be permitted.</p>	<p>Similar to above although areas where no dwellings are allowed.</p>	<p>Similar to above but a more restrictive designation.</p>	<p>Saved. As above</p>
<p><b>Policy H22</b> In the main settlements of the District, residential development will be permitted on previously developed urban land outside a Housing Policy</p>	<p>Sets a criteria for the development of housing on PDL outside policy boundaries at</p>	<p>Only allows PDL to be developed at major settlements. Uses relocation as</p>	<p>This policy relates to PDL outside main settlements. It introduces the concept of 'well related' and only</p>	<p>Replaced. The raft of policies and particularly CP1 &amp; CP2 should</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>Boundary provided that the site is:                      (i) not identified for an alternative form of development in this Local Plan;                      (ii) well related to the existing pattern of development; and                      (iii) accessible by public transport.                      Proposals which would involve land currently in employment use will only be permitted if the business is relocated to an alternative site in the settlement which does not increase reliance on the private car, or the land and building(s) are unsuitable and not viable for alternative employment uses.</p>	<p>the main settlements.</p>	<p>employment criteria.</p>	<p>allows change out of employment uses where alternatives are kept in the District. The policy also introduces transport and re-location within Wiltshire as part of the criterion. Potentially this can be covered by other parts of the policy.</p>	<p>provide similar levels of policy protection.</p>
<p><b>Policy H23</b>                      Undeveloped land outside a Housing Policy Boundary, Housing Restraint Area, Special Restraint Area or New Forest Housing Policy Area and not identified for development in this Local Plan will be considered to be countryside where the erection of new dwellings will be permitted only where provided for by policies H26 or H27 of this Local Plan.</p>	<p>Defines all land outside HPBs, HRAs and SRAs as countryside and only permits new dwellings in exceptional circumstances</p>	<p>No countryside development.</p>	<p>Similar policy to other countryside dwellings policies. It refers to H26 &amp; H27 which allow development of affordable housing and homes for agriculture and forestry purposes.</p>	<p>Replaced. Exceptions and natural environment policies will provide similar policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy H30</b>                      The replacement of an existing dwelling in the countryside will be permitted provided that:                      (i) the proposed replacement dwelling is not significantly larger and has no greater impact than the existing dwelling;                      (ii) the design of the new dwelling is of a high standard and is appropriate to the rural surroundings;                      (iii) the sitting of the replacement dwelling is closely related to that of the existing;</p>	<p>Policy set criteria for replacement dwellings in the countryside.</p>	<p>Replacement criteria again has a strong design criteria. Sitting and size can be different but not significantly.</p>	<p>This is development control heavy policy that controls countryside development of residential. This policy is focused solely on design and the main principle is connected to footprint and size.</p>	<p>Replaced. As before a number of policies should replace this policy.</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>(iv) current parking and access standards can be met; and                      (v) the existing dwelling has not been abandoned.                      Where the residential use of the existing dwelling is the result of a temporary, or a series of temporary permission, any permanent replacement dwelling will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.</p>				
<p><b>Policy C2</b>                      Development in the countryside will be strictly limited and will not be permitted unless it would benefit the local economy and maintain or enhance the environment.</p>	<p>Sets out that development in the countryside must be linked to economic development</p>	<p>Economic development is permitted in the countryside, there is no audit on size etc.</p>	<p>The policy allows for economic development in the countryside. There is no criteria other than enhancement of the environment.</p>	<p>Replace. As above</p>
<p><b>West Wiltshire Local Plan</b></p>				
<p><b>H1 Further Housing Development Within Towns</b>                      Proposals for housing development within the built-up areas of Bradford on Avon, Melksham, Trowbridge, Westbury and Warminster will be permitted provided that:                      A Siting, layout and design considerations are satisfactory and they are in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.                      B They would not create inappropriate backland or tandem development;                      C They provide adequate services for the disposal of surface water, without increase of flood risk to downstream riparian owners;                      Ca They provide adequate water supplies, sewerage and sewage treatment, without adversely affecting</p>	<p>Sets out criteria for housing proposals within built up areas of major towns</p>	<p>Only relevant for towns, again provides heavy emphasis on open space and identifies backland development as an issue. Includes emphasis on infrastructure.</p>	<p>The policy provides a detailed set of criteria for development at all towns that includes design and infrastructure criterion. This policy will be replaced by the delivery strategy in core policy 2, the individual community area strategies and other policies.</p>	<p>Replace.</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>the environment;</p> <p>D They do not result in the loss of an open area or visual gap important for recreation or amenity reasons.</p> <p>E They protect and conserve important nature conservation interests.</p> <p>F They provide safe and convenient connection to existing and planned pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks, the highway and, where appropriate, rail facilities, without creating transport problems;</p> <p>G They do not conflict with any other Structure Plan or District Plan 1st Alteration policies.</p> <p>Priority will be given to proposals for the reuse of previously developed land.</p> <p>Further housing development outside of the urban area, as defined by town policy limits, will not be permitted during the Plan period.</p>				
<p><b>H17 Village Policy Limits</b></p> <p>Village Policy Limits have been defined for the following villages as indicated on the Proposals Map: Limited development within the defined Village Policy Limits will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>A The development would be in keeping with the character, appearance and distinctive spatial form of the settlement;</p> <p>B The development is in accordance with the District Plan 1st Alteration policies which seek to protect the</p>	<p>Defines criteria for development within Village Policy Limits.</p>	<p>Mentions distinctive spatial form as a key development criteria. Again backland, open space and infrastructure feature heavily.</p>	<p>The policy uses as similar criteria to the one above and as such should be replaced by a raft of policies.</p>	<p>Replace</p>

Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy Addendum

Policy	Intention of Policy	Points to Consider	Relevant policy for the Core Strategy	To be saved or replaced
<p>natural environment, including water resources and flood risk and the built environment;                      C It would not create inappropriate backland or tandem development;                      D It would not result in the loss of an important open space or visual gap;                      E It can be satisfactorily serviced, there is adequate infrastructure, including water supplies and sewage treatment and it does not create highway problems.</p>				
<p><b>H18 Areas of Minimum Change</b>                      Areas of Minimum change within Village Policy Limits have been defined, as indicated on the Proposals Map.                      Within Areas of Minimum Change planning permission will not be granted for new housing development.</p>	<p>Defined areas where no new housing development will be appropriate.</p>	<p>Does not provide any indication to replacement/re-use.</p>	<p>A supplementary policy that provides a level of protection to specific areas in villages. If boundaries are removed at smaller villages this policy is likely to be needed</p>	<p>Saved. Extra level of protection should be retained.</p>
<p><b>H19 Development in Open Countryside</b>                      New Dwellings in the countryside and in settlements without Village Policy Limits will not be permitted unless justified in connection with the essential needs of agriculture or forestry.</p>	<p>Countryside policy in regards to new dwellings.</p>	<p>Only allows for dwellings in connection to agriculture and forestry</p>	<p>Simple criteria for replacement dwellings in the countryside consists of agriculture, forestry or rural enterprise and replacement/re-use.</p>	<p>Replaced</p>