Note of Steering Group Meeting held on 13th August 2018

Attendance:

John Matthews; Mike Johnson; John Thomson; Nigel Freeth; Judy Sharp; Graham Hayman; John Knight; and Nick Manassei.

Apologies for absence:

Graham Morris; Harry Stephens

1. JM referred to the Briefing Note that had been circulated in advance of the meeting and confirmed that the purpose of the meeting was as follows:

- To consider all of the comments received on the draft plan following its publication in accordance with the Regulation 14 consultation procedures.
- To agree any necessary changes to the draft plan taking into account those comments.
- To consider the draft Development Briefs that have been prepared for Sites 1,2 and 3. If approved these will be attached to and form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- To consider the contents of the Basic Conditions Statement that has been prepared which has to be submitted to Wiltshire Council together with all of the other documentation in accordance with Regulation 15.
- To approve the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan in its amended form to Wiltshire Council at the earliest opportunity so that the plan can be progressed.

2. MJ ran through the main items set out in the Briefing Note. In summary:

a) The six week consultation period on the draft Neighbourhood Plan ended on 9th April 2018.

b) A schedule of all the comments received on the draft plan together with some comments on each and a series of recommendations had been prepared and circulated in advance of the meeting. On the advice of Wiltshire Council the names and addresses of all of the "individuals" who responded to the plan have been removed bearing in mind that this "schedule" will in due course form part of the background papers and hence incorporated in the Consultation Report. Individual respondents are therefore simply referred to as Resident 1 etc.

c) The Steering Group would be asked to consider and approve each of the proposed recommended alterations/additions to the plan as shown on the attached schedule at the meeting.

d) The individual responses received could be summarised as follows:

- 24 completed forms were received from local residents. All but one of these supported the draft NP. The one objection received being from an individual who objected to the proposed scale of the housing allocation on Site 1 (Sopworth Lane).
- Some individuals made specific comments on various elements of the draft NP.
- A form was received from the Chairman of Sherston Tennis Club who is keen to ensure that consideration is given to improving facilities and access to the tennis courts on the "football field".
- The owners of The Angel Hotel pointed out that the draft plan incorrectly described their property as an office. This will need to be corrected.
- The owners of Site 4 (which is proposed to be safeguarded for future recreational use) raised concerns about what was meant by the term "safeguarding". A meeting was held with the owners to clarify this matter. The owners have now confirmed that, subject to certain safeguards to protect their interests, they are happy with the proposed policy (Policy 10).

e) The following Statutory Consultees responded to the draft plan:

- Highways England – who had no comments to make on the draft plan.
- The Coal Authority – who had no comments to make on the draft plan.
- Natural England – who had made comments on certain aspects of the draft plan – details of which were set out in the schedule to be discussed.
- Wiltshire Council – who raised various points of detail about the draft plan – details of which were set out in the schedule to be discussed.
- Historic England – who had made detailed comments on each of the proposed allocated development sites – details of which were set out in the schedule to be discussed. MJ pointed out that it was this issue that had effectively delayed progress on the emerging plan for a few months whilst further work was undertaken to deal with the matters raised. This had necessitated the undertaking of a considerable amount of additional work – including the preparation of a professional "Heritage Assessment" of both Site 1 (Sopworth Lane) and Site 2 (The Vicarage) and subsequently the preparation of a Development Brief for all three proposed allocated development sites. The latter being prepared at the suggestion of the Wiltshire Council's Conservation Architect as the means of overcoming any remaining concerns about heritage issues. The contents of the three development briefs would need to be considered and approved at the meeting if they were going to be incorporated in the plan.

3. The Steering Group then went on to consider in turn all of the comments/representations received on the draft plan. The attached schedule (see below) provides details of:

- All of the comments/representations made on the draft plan.
- A commentary and recommendation in respect of every comment received.
- The decision of the Steering Group in respect of every comment made and the action taken – including any changes that it was considered necessary to make to the plan before its final publication (and any changes to the related documents).

4. The Steering Group then went on to consider the Development Briefs that had been prepared for the Sopworth Lane, Vicarage, and The Elms sites. Two suggested additions to the Development Brief made earlier by Zoe Metcalfe (relating to the possible need on Site 1 to make provision for an emergency access to Saxon Close and the possibility of safeguarding land for a future bus stop) to be added to the Sopworth Lane Brief. All three Development Briefs were approved.

5. The Steering Group then considered the contents of the draft Basic Conditions Statement. This was approved for publication together with the amended NP.

6. Finally the Steering Group unanimously approved the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan in its amended form to Wiltshire Council at the earliest opportunity.

Please see below the full schedule of comments/representations made on the draft NP together with the recommendations and subsequent actions (decisions) made.

NAME	ADDRESS OR	COMMENTS	Commentary and	ACTION TAKEN

	ORGANISATION		Recommended Response	Following SG meeting on 13th August 2018
Resident 1	Sherston resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Chrystele Garnier Highways England	Highways England, Brunel House, 930 Hempton Court, Aztec West , Bristol, BS32 4SR	Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the submission version of the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance consists of the M4 which runs some distance to the south of the plan area. We are therefore satisfied that the proposed plan policies are unlikely to result in development which will impact significantly on the SRN and we have no comments to make. However, this response does not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the appropriate policy at the time.	Comments noted.	None required.
Resident 2	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP with the exception of	Support noted and welcomed. In absence of any alternative	Following discussions with Wiltshire Council (see

		Policy 3 (Broadband). No changes suggested.	suggestions or more detailed comments in respect of Policy 3 no action recommended.	below) it was agreed to make no change to Policy 3.
Resident 3	Sherston resident	Supports the SNP as drafted. Specific comments: Policy 1 – "Consideration should be given to the return of commercial businesses in premises which are now residential". Policy 2 – "The recreation ground should be retained as an open space with maximum grassed area". Policy 3 – "The development of 5G should be encouraged. The Broadband boxes should be installed in more suitable locations.	Support noted and welcomed. Policy 1 – whilst sympathetic to the idea this is not something that can realistically be controlled/realised via the planning process. Recommend no change. Policy 2 – the policy seeks to secure the retention of the recreation ground as an area of open space. How it is used and laid out for recreational use is considered to be a matter for the landowner. Policy 3 – this is not something that the SNP can influence. This policy deals specifically with the provision of high quality broadband access to all new developments within the SNP area. The provision of BT boxes is	None required. No change. No change. No change.

			outside of the control of the Local Planning Authority.	
		Policy 5 – "The amenity of this site (the Vicarage) should be protected from unnecessary development on the recreation ground".	Policy 5 – The amenity of this site should be unaffected by development on the recreation ground given its proposed protection under Policy 2.	No change.
		Policy 6 – "Subject to restrictions to preserve the character of the area".	Policy 6 – This policy already incorporates such a requirement.	No change.
		Policy 9 – " The facilities at the Football Field should be upgraded. The recreation ground should be protected especially as it is the site of an ancient earthwork.	Policy 9 – Policy 11 is specifically targeted at enabling such improvements to be made at the Football Field. Policy 2 seeks to protect the Recreation Ground from inappropriate development (requiring planning permission).	No change.

Resident 4	Sherston resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 5	Sherston resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.

Resident 6	Sherston resident	Supports the Plan. General comments – "The existing road system is completely inadequate for the proposed development. The use of existing verges and a one way system with mini roundabout should be given serious consideration by the Highway Authority as part of the planning approval".	Support noted and welcomed. General comments – it is assumed that the author is expressing concern about the potential impact of the proposed development on Site 1 on the local highway network. It will of course be for the Highway Authority to determine what works will be required to be undertaken should development proceed on Site 1. It should be noted however that the Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken by Arup's concluded that it is "unlikely that road users would perceive the increase in traffic and that the local highway network would continue to function adequately" should this development take place. Wiltshire Council Highways raised no concerns about this proposal when consulted in advance of the finalisation of the draft SNP. The Arup TIA does identify some possible offsite highway improvement works that could	None required. The Neighbourhood Plan has been modified to include specific reference to the possible use of CIL payments for the carrying out of additional offsite highway works (as per Policy 8 of the plan). Decisions on the precise works required to facilitate the development of Site 1 to be decided by Wiltshire Council at the planning application stage.

			be undertaken to ensure that a safe and inclusive access is provided between Site 1 and the rest of the village. Policy 8 supports the implementation of any such proposals that are deemed necessary or appropriate as part of that development. Some of these works could be funded from the anticipated CIL payments. A Transport Statement prepared by Miles White Transport concludes that: 1. Existing traffic volumes are very low on all the roads surrounding the site. 2.The site is accessible on foot with the village centre being within 500m or a 6 minute walk. 3. The site is accessible by cycle with all parts of the village being within an acceptable cycling distance. 4. The site is accessible by bus services that operate via the High Street in the village centre. This allows regular travel to Yate and	

			Malmesbury. 5. Vehicular access to the site will be from Sopworth Lane and will include the introduction of a 30mph speed limit. The associated sight lines accord with current design standards. 6. Pedestrian access between the site and the village will be provided that will improve links to the GP surgery site and the existing primary school. 7. The site will provide car parking in accordance with the current Wiltshire Council standards. 8. The proposed development will generate 65, 49 and 56 two-way vehicle movements in the morning, school and evening peak hours respectively, i.e. a maximum of around 1 per minute. 9. The increased number of vehicles using the Crossroad Junction will be barely perceptible to other roads users and the overall volumes will still	

			be well within the typical carrying capacity of these roads. 10. This level of increase will not have an adverse effect upon operational performance or road safety at this junction, or on any of the roads themselves. 11. The development will introduce a Travel Plan that will seek to promote the use of non car modes when travelling to and from the site. This will be achieved primarily by providing detailed information on the availability of non-car travel options together with the provision of facilities that will encourage their use. Recommend that an additional section be added to the NP dealing specifically with how the CIL payments might be used and making the possible use of CIL payments for the carrying out of additional offsite highway works (as per Policy 8 of the plan) a high	

		Policy 4 – "Support should be given to the completion of a new surgery as the two senior doctor's who own the existing premises retire and will be selling the existing facilities". Policy 7 – "Priority to be given to complete replacement of sheltered accommodation".	priority. Policy 4 – support noted. Full details of the reasoning behind this proposed allocation are given in the SNP documents. Policy 7 – this is the intended outcome of this policy.	None required. None required.
Resident 7	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 8	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 9	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 10	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 11	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies as set out in the draft SNP. No changes sought	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 12	Sherston Resident	Supports the Plan and no changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.

		General Comments – “Well thought out – a coherent strategy for this lovely village”.	General Comments – noted.	None required.
		Policy 1 – “Priority should be given to this area. It needs strengthening”.	Policy 1 – noted and agreed. No change needed.	No change.
		Policy 2 – “This is vital”.	Policy 2 - noted and agreed. No change needed.	No change.
		Policy 3 – “Essential for attracting new businesses and maintaining a connected community”.	Policy 3 - noted and agreed. No change needed.	No change.
		Policy 4 – “ The GPs surgery should be funded from health service resources where possible.”	Policy 4 – comments noted. The day to day running of the GP surgery would of course be funded by the NHS. The SNP cannot determine how the new build surgery is actually funded. That is a matter for the landowners and GPs to determine.	No change.
		Policy 5 – “Build a better vicarage”.	Policy 5 – comments noted and agreed. No change needed.	No change.

		Policy 6 – " Better use could be made of this land". Policy 9 – " This should also be a priority that is higher up the list. Better use of facilities at the tennis club and football club. Don't encroach on existing facilities at the Rec."	Policy 6 – comments noted and agreed. No change needed. Policy 9 – comments noted and agreed. No change needed.	No change. No change.
Owner	Angel House High Street, SN16 0LH	Supports the plan but some changes sought. General comments – "The Plan has been really well thought through and well communicated". Policy 1 – "The Angel is cited under Policy 1 as premises to be protected. It is described as a restaurant and offices. However, it is an eight bedroom hotel and tearoom. If it is to be protected it will need to be agreed that it is not offices. Policy 4 – "Cycle pathway for children to cycle to the school?".	Support noted and welcomed. General Comments – comments noted. Policy 1 – It is fully accepted the Angel is an hotel and restaurant/tea room and not in office use. This was an error in the wording of the policy. Recommend that a change to the description is made. Policy 4- on site provision of cycle paths is something that could be incorporated in the	None required. None required. The reference to the Angel in Policy 1 has been altered as requested. Policy 4 has been amended to make a specific reference to cycling.

		Policy 8 – " Cycle pathways for cycling and mobility scooters too".	"requirements" section of this policy. Off site provision would be a matter for County Highways to consider – in the context of Policy 8. Recommend amending the wording of Policy 4 to incorporate a reference to cycling. Policy 8 – see Para 8.4.32 of the NP which refers to the needs of cyclists. This Policy is aimed at all forms of movement (including pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooters). No change recommended.	No change.
Residents 13 and 14	Sherston Residents	Support the plan with no changes sought. General Comments – "The village has the room to expand and it will be good to do so. The surgery is vital to the village and a move and expansion is important. Policy 6 – "Improvement needs to be made to the road around that area before an increase in housing".	Support noted and welcomed. General Comments – noted and agreed. Policy 6 – This site lies on the corner of Green Lane and Sandpits Lane. It is assumed that	None required. None required. Policy 6 – the Policy has been altered to make direct reference to the Development Brief that has

			access is most likely going to be achievable from Green Lane for any new build housing with only limited access off Sandpits Lane. A Development Brief has been prepared which will form part of the NP to help inform the final site layout. This seeks to ensure that access to any new build development on the site is taken off Green Lane. The proposed access arrangements will need to be the subject of detailed negotiations with the County Highway Authority at the planning application stage. No objections have been raised by Wiltshire Council to this proposed housing allocation from a highway viewpoint. It is of course a long-standing housing allocation. Recommend amending the wording of Policy 6 to make direct reference to the prepared Development Brief.	been prepared for the site. See Appendix 3 to the NP.
Resident 15	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan. A few changes suggested. General Comments – “Thank you to all	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.

		who have done so much work to prepare such a comprehensive plan".	General Comments – Noted.	None required.
		Policy 1 – "I believe that it should be made more difficult still for the designated business premises to be de-designated and used for other purposes".	Policy 1 – Whilst fully supportive of the sentiment it is considered that it would be difficult to strengthen the policy without stepping beyond what would be acceptable from a planning policy viewpoint. This policy mirrors others found elsewhere in Local Plans but goes further by identifying specific sites to which the policy can be applied. All of these sites were identified via the SNP consultation process and hence represent the stated wishes of the village. No change recommended.	No change.
		Policy 4 – "Subject to the strengthening of Policy 1 (as above)."	Policy 4 – comments noted. No change recommended.	No Change.
		Policy 8 – "However this should be strengthened. This is critical to securing the wider objectives of the plan. Funding needs to be identified that this is	Policy 8 – any works required as a direct result of any of the proposals set out in the SNP will of course have to be funded by	The NP has been amended to incorporate a new section dealing specifically

		delivered – not just an aspiration.	the developer. These works will be identified by the County Highway Authority following the submission of any planning applications. It is unfortunately not possible to superimpose any additional off-site highway (or other) requirements on the developer. It will be for the community to decide (probably via the Parish Council) what additional works might be deemed desirable to achieve in conjunction with any specific development – to which the anticipated CIL payments can be directed. This policy is aimed at ensuring that the need to provide enhanced inclusive access between Site 1 and the rest of the village is high on the Agenda when such decisions come to be made. Recommend that an additional section be added to the NP dealing specifically with how the CIL payments might be used and making the possible use of CIL payments for the carrying out of additional offsite highway works	with how any CIL payments might be utilised. Additional offsite highway works are given high priority.

			(as per Policy 8 of the plan) a high priority.	
Resident 16	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan with no changes sought. General Comments – "Well thought out in my opinion. Everyone's needs considered well." Policy 4 – "This is very important. New housing to keep village vibrant and especially the GP surgery".	Support noted and welcomed. General Comments – noted. Policy 4 – comments noted and agreed.	None required. None required. None required.
Resident 17	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan with no changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 18	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan with no changes sought.	Support noted and welcomed.	None required.
Resident 19	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies in the plan with no changes sought. General Comments – "Again as I always say to you about plans – social housing. This village is full of retired and privileged people. Where are the local youth supposed to live – Chippenham, Malmesbury, Bristol?!!! Not half buy and	Support noted and welcomed. General Comments – Policy 4 provides an opportunity to provide a significant number of additional affordable houses in the village – capable of meeting the level of need identified in the	None required. No change.

		rent – too expensive ."	2012 Housing Needs Survey. It is anticipated that a further review of local housing need will be undertaken in conjunction with any planning application submitted in respect of Site 1 – see below the comments made by LRM Planning relating to this aspect of Policy 4. No change recommended.	
Resident 20	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan with no changes sought. Policy 1 – "Many of us have already felt the impact of losing our excellent butchers/greengrocers shop. Limited ability to prevent this is well demonstrated. Need to support Local Businesses!" Policy 4 – "We do hear disturbing reports of how many developers renege on agreements for % of affordable houses to be included. Vital that as full protection as possible is brought to bear.	Support noted and welcomed. Policy 1 – this policy may not prevent the loss of individual "businesses" (such as the greengrocers or butchers shops) but will hopefully help minimise the loss of further business premises in the village and surrounding parish. Policy 4 – it will of course be up to Wiltshire Council to implement this policy – which together with Wiltshire Council Core Strategy Policy 43 will seek to secure the target of 40% provision on this	None required. None required. None required.

			site.	
Resident 21	Sherston Resident	Supports the plan with no changes sought. General Comments – "Thank you to all who have worked on this. Sherston needs to move with the times in the 21st Century but please ensure that the village remains the community it has always been". Policy 1 – "Tucks – urgent need for a replacement food store (for butcher and greengrocer)." Policy 4 – "Single storey building for GP surgery with plenty of consulting rooms for visiting services (e.g opticians, dentist). A serious mistake was made in not including pre-school facilities when the new school was built."	Support noted and welcomed. General Comments – noted and agreed. Policy 1 - – the draft policy may not prevent the loss of individual "businesses" (such as the greengrocers or butchers shops) but will hopefully help minimise the loss of further business premises in the village and surrounding parish. Policy 4 – comments noted.	None required. None required. None required. None required.

		Policy 5 – "New vicarage a priority for me but maybe a space for me in the burial ground in the future?" Policy 8 – "But equally necessary to provide enough car parking for staff and patients at the surgery".	Policy 5 – noted. Policy 8 – agreed. Policy 4 allocates land for "a new enhanced GP surgery with associated parking and space for related mobile services" seeks to achieve this. The Wiltshire Core strategy lays down more specific parking requirements. See also the Development Brief that has been prepared confirming this.	None required. No change.
Resident 22	Sherston Resident	Is supportive of all of the policies in the draft SNP with the exception of Policies 3 and 4. Policy 3 does not recognise the still woeful provision, by modern standards, of internet access in Sherston and that most people I know in the villages do not currently experience anything like the target 25M capacity, which in itself is out of date. This must be a priority for the reasons detailed below.	Support for these policies noted and welcomed. Policy 3 – whilst supportive of the views expressed here in relation to the speed of internet connectivity in the village unfortunately the SNP is unable to influence the general level (speed) of provision throughout the plan area. The SNP is a "land	None required. No change.

			use" plan which can nevertheless require developers of new build properties to meet the standards set out in this policy. This type of policy has been successfully implemented elsewhere in the country and is deemed to be compatible with NPPF 173. This policy also it should be noted states that "where possible and desirable additional ducting should be provided that also contributes to a local access network for the wider community". This is considered to be about as far as one can go in seeking to influence future faster internet provision. No change recommended.	
		Policy 4 proposes housing development significantly in excess of the demonstrated local need, in excess of the development requirements in Core Policy 13 of the WCS, and of local opinion as assessed in the Sherston Housing Needs 2012 survey (where 90% of respondents asked for <20 new units). This proposal is not a scale of development I can support.	Policy 4 – this issue has been debated at length over the last five years (see the Consultation Statement for full details). The proposals set out in Policy 4 received a very high level of support from the village when this issue was canvassed in January 2017 - being that Site 1	No change.

		I believe we should safeguard the character of Sherston now and also as pressure grows for more development in coming years. I would not want Sherston to suffer the irreversible change in character new development has bought to Tetbury. I believe a different solution to re-homing the GP surgery be sought, based around a less ambitious plan and capital contributions from others, such as the GPs and surrounding villages who also benefit. The SNP comments that the proposed development represents a slowing down of development at Sherston but proposes 50 new units in the next 8 years vs. 90 built in the last 18 - an increase in rate!	should be allocated for a mixed use development comprising up to 45 houses (40% affordable) plus land being set aside to accommodate a new GP Surgery, a pre-school facility and for the future expansion of Sherston Primary School. This single development will help meet most of the key objectives identified for the SNP. The Housing Needs Survey referred to by the author was a snapshot view of the affordable housing needs of the village as they stood in 2012 – no more and no less. The situation has now moved on. Despite the best efforts of a group of individuals in the village over several months - who were tasked with identifying and/or bringing forward a range of alternative options that could achieve the same outcomes (objectives) with fewer houses – no alternative solutions that were viable or deliverable could be found.	

			The scale of development proposed is not considered to be incompatible with either the Wiltshire Core Strategy or guidance in the NPPF. No change recommended.	
Chairman Sherston Tennis Club	Sherston Resident	Policy 4 – "to encourage greater community usage of the courts (incl. kids coaching) and provide a safer playing environment, we would like planning to consider provision of a clubhouse and floodlights (the club would like it noted that it intends to add floodlighting in the future). A tennis or shared sports facility needs power, water and sewage connections, and this is an ideal opportunity to install them. The current lack of water and electricity also hinders maintenance of the courts (e.g. power cleaning). Vehicle access to the courts is only possible by driving around the football pitches, and site 1 could provide alternative access and parking."	Policy 4 – pedestrian and cycle access is proposed to be provided via Site 1 linking to the sports field. A Development Brief has been prepared that seeks to influence the shape of any future development on Site 1 which shows this. It is not considered likely that any additional on-site parking (beyond that already envisaged to serve the GP surgery and education uses) will be provided to serve the sports facilities on the adjoining football field. Vehicular access to the sports field is not something that can readily be achieved given the intervening land ownership (the access road leading through to the water tower). It is suggested that the Tennis Club be invited to speak to the landowners/	No changes made to Policy 4 reflecting these comments – however see the Development Brief prepared for the Sopworth Lane Site (Site 1) at Appendix 1 of the NP which seeks to deal with the pedestrian/cycling access issue.

			developers to establish whether the desired water and electricity supplies can be provided. This is not considered to be something that the NP can influence or require. Policy 11 supports the provision of new sports facilities and/or a clubhouse on the football field site. No change recommended.	
		Policy 11 – "As above, consideration should be made for future expansion of the tennis club (e.g. clubhouse/changing rooms/toilet) or shared sports facilities, including provision of utilities and access/parking."	Policy 11 – this policy supports the provision of this type of shared facility. No change recommended.	No change.
Resident 23	Sherston Resident	General Comments - Creating a new service hub for Sherston around the school, including a Doctor's surgery and provision for a pre-school playgroup and additional housing is a good idea, in the	General Comments – noted and agreed.	None required.

		absence of the site on Easton Town which would have had direct access onto the B4040.		
		I would be very concerned if any developments at the corner of Sandpits Lane and Green Lane (policy 6&7) had access onto Sandpits Lane. The road narrows significantly at the current entrance to the existing house on proposed site 3 and the lane is already tested to the limits by the increase in traffic caused by the new developments of housing, including Carriers Close. (25 houses added since 1985)	Comments noted. It will be for Wiltshire Council to determine the precise access arrangements. A Development Brief has been prepared for this site which seeks to ensure that most if not all of the new development on The Elms site (Policy 6) takes access from Green Lane. Recommend that the Development Brief that has been prepared for the site be added to the NP.	A Development Brief has been prepared for this site which deals with this issue – see Policy 6 and Appendix 3 of the NP.
		Policy 6 - Reservations concerning access, particularly onto Sandpits Lane. All access should be directed along Green Lane to Knockdown road. The junction of Sandpits Lane with Green Lane is already very dangerous and the Lane narrows significantly after this junction.	See comments above.	See above.
		Policy 7 - Concern for parking and access if increases the traffic on Sandpits Lane	Policy 7 – the SNP supports the	

		and particularly at the dangerous junction with Green Lane. Existing pedestrian access should be maintained onto Church Street from Anthony Close.	idea of redeveloping this site for some form of care facility. This is a matter that will be determined by Wiltshire Council at some future date. Recommend comments noted.No action required at present time.	No change.
Owners of Site 4	Sherston Residents	Policy 10 - We are the owners of Site 4 – a two acre strip of land adjoining the football field on Knockdown Road. We note, with interest, your reference to the land being 'safeguarded' for the future expansion of the sports field. We would be most grateful if you would provide a response to the following questions please: - Please would you define your use of the word 'safeguarded'. - To date we have not been contacted by anyone from either the Neighbourhood Planning Committee or the Parish Council regarding 'safeguarding' the land. Please confirm how your assumptions around it's future use have taken into consideration any plans that the owners of the land might have.	A meeting has been held with the owners of Site 4 to discuss their concerns. They were particularly concerned about the term "safeguarded" land. It was explained to them that there was no suggestion that this land would be compulsory purchased and indeed more to the point that the expansion of the existing sports facilities onto their land could as previously advised only take place with their full agreement and cooperation. They have since confirmed in writing that they would be willing to make their land available at some future date for this purpose provided that: 1.The site was sold at full market value to the Parish Council (to	No change.

		Whilst it is entirely permissible to submit a planning application which contains land not owned by the party submitting the request, we feel a little aggrieved that you have made a public declaration without involving us. We are not opposed to your proposals regarding Policy 10 but would welcome some clarity and engagement from the Committee.	ensure that they did not lose money on relinquishing the plot). 2.Any sale included an appropriate uplift clause. 3.An alternative paddock had first been identified for their use elsewhere in and around the village.	
The Coal Authority	200 Lichfield Lane, Berry Hill Mansfield Nottinghamshire NG18 4RG	Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it. Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority using the contact details above.	Comments noted.	None required.
Charles Routh Natural		We have the following comments to make with respect to this Neighbourhood		

England		Development Plan: Site 1/Policy 4. The site is bounded on one side by a public right of way. If this development is likely to degrade the amenity value of this public right of way, it would be reasonable to set out in this policy measures (either on or off site) to ensure no net detriment to the amenity value of the public right of way network in the area.	Policy 4 – the existence of a public right of way alongside western site boundary previously noted. Further work has now been undertaken to consider the means of safeguarding the amenity of this PROW. This has included the preparation of a Development Brief for the site – a copy of which will be attached to the SNP as an Appendix – which makes specific reference to the need to safeguard the amenity of the PROW. A "Landscape and Visual Appraisal" Report that has been prepared for Site 1 by a company (EDP) acting for the landowners has recently been submitted for our consideration. (A copy of this report has been placed on the SNP website). This confirms, that subject to the introduction of appropriate measures it should be entirely possible to safeguard the amenity of the PROW. It is recommended that the	Policy 4 has been modified to make it clear that the PROW needs to be safeguarded. The Development Brief prepared for the site makes specific refence to the need to protect the amenity value of the PROW. This now forms part of the NP.

			Development Brief that has been prepared for the site be modified to take account of some of the recommendations contained in this report and that the Brief itself forms part of the NP.	
		Site 1/Policy 4. This development is likely to be construed as "major development" as per para 116 of the NPPF. As such the plan should provide evidence that the "major development test" set out in this para is met. Failure to do so might mean the plan is unsound. This should include an analysis of the landscape impact of the policy. Apologies if this has already been provided in the supporting information, but resource constraints and priorities have meant I've not looked at it.	Policy 4 – It is accepted that the development of Site 1 is likely to be construed as a "major development" in the context of Para 116 of the NNPF. The landscape issues relevant to the consideration of this matter are set out in the SEA Scoping Report and related Sustainability Appraisal. This issue will need to be addressed in the Basic Conditions Statement that has to be prepared to support the Regulation 15 submission. It was addressed in the "Landscape and Visual Appraisal Report" prepared by EDF (see above). A copy of this Report has been	This issue is fully addressed in the Basic Conditions Statement. Natural England have now confirmed that there is sufficient evidence to address the Para 116 NPPF issue. A copy of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal Report prepared by EDP has been placed on the SNP website.

			sent to Natural England who have since responded as follows: "The level of detail …. would appear to be more than adequate for the purposes of supplying evidence around an assessment of any detrimental effect on the landscape, and the extent to which that could be moderated, as far as the soundness of the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned." Recommend that a copy of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal Report prepared by EDP be placed on the NP website and that this issue be fully addressed in the Basic Conditions Statement.	
Resident 24	Sherston Resident	Supports all of the policies set out in the draft plan with no changes sought. General Comments – "The plan appears to provide a good way forward for the village whilst ensuring the protection of the integral parts of the village for the future".	Support noted and welcomed. Noted and agreed.	None required. None required.

LRM Planning Ltd (on behalf of the owners and prospective purchasers of Site 1)	22 Cathedral Road, Cardiff, CF11 9LJ	**GENERAL COMMENTS** "I am writing on behalf of my client Acorn Property Group (APG) in response to the Regulation 14 public consultation on the draft Pre-Submission Sherston Neighbourhood Plan. APG have entered into a contract with the landowners and therefore have a legal interest in the site (Site 1). This response has been prepared having regard to the following consultation documents: • Sherston Neighbourhood Plan – February 2018 • Sustainability Assessment – February 2018 • Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Note – February 2018	The Steering Group were aware of this situation and acknowledge the importance of this submission in the context of seeking to confirm the viability and deliverability of Site 1 as part of the draft SNP. Noted.	None required. None required.

		• Consultation Report – February 2018 It is recognised that the Parish Council is consulting on a draft neighbourhood plan and that this is the first formal opportunity that stakeholders, including APG, have had to comment on the proposals. It is acknowledged that the plan may be subject to further revision following the receipt of responses from both the community and a number of technical/statutory consultees to the current consultation. With this in mind APG reserve the right to make additional or alternative comments on the emerging plan during the plan making process. APG welcome the inclusion of Site 1 West of Knockdown Road in the draft Plan and we outline detailed comments on the site allocation policy below. The development of the site will be key to the delivery of the Plan's vision and objectives. Ongoing discussion with APG will therefore be essential in order to ensure that the Plan meets the	Noted. Support noted and welcomed. Noted and agreed. (N.B. A	None required. None required.

		requirements of the basic conditions and delivers the sustainable development that the community want to see in the area. With this in mind we encourage the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to continue to engage with APG in a positive and open manner as they work towards the finalisation of the Plan." In September 2017 LRM Planning submitted a Site Appraisal document for Site 1 on behalf of APG and we note that this has been included in the list of supporting documents that are available to view of the Parish Council's website. This representation should be read in conjunction with the Appraisal, a copy of which is enclosed for reference. As noted in the document additional technical work is required in relation to the site. We can confirm that this has been commissioned and is under way in respect of ecology, heritage, landscape and transport. Studies relating to these areas will be submitted as soon as they have been completed. The following updates on each can be provided at this point as follows:	meeting has been held with LRM since this submission at which all of their various comments and these likely recommendations were discussed. No changes have been made to these recommendations as a result of those discussions). Noted. (N.B. Copies of all of the various reports referred to have now been received and have been placed on the website).	None required. Copies of all of these reports have been placed on the NP website.

		Ecology Focus Ecology have been appointed to prepare a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for the site. A site visit has been carried out and research of third party records is underway. The report is expected shortly and will be submitted to the Parish Council once completed. From the work undertaken to date we can advise that no immediate ecological constraints for the site have been identified, and that the consultant ecologist is not recommending that any further specialist surveys are required. It anticipated that an Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Scheme would be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to any development commencing on the site. This is usually conditioned as part of any planning permission and provides a working method statement for the retention and protection of any identified features of ecological value (mainly the species-rich hedgerows) and protection	We have now received a copy of this report. This recommends that: "Once the development proposals are confirmed, a detailed Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Strategy should be written and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The strategy will ensure that any future development of this site retains existing features and habitats of ecological value (e.g. mature, species-rich hedgerows), minimises the impact upon protected species (e.g. nesting birds) and maximises the potential of retained habitats to enhance biodiversity and contribute towards local and national biodiversity targets." It is recommended that Policy 4 be modified to incorporate the requirement that a detailed Ecological and Mitigation Strategy be prepared for the site	Policy 4 has been amended to incorporate the following additional requirement: "A detailed Ecological and Mitigation Strategy that ensures that any future development of this site retains existing features and habitats of ecological value, minimises the impact on protected species and maximises the potential of retained habitats to enhance biodiversity." The Development Brief for the site has been modified to incorporate some of the details included in the Focus Report. This can be found at Appendix 1 of the SNP.

		of any protected/notable species that may be present (e.g. nesting birds) for example. It will also identify where ecological enhancement can occur within any proposed development scheme. Heritage Cotswold **Archaeology** have been appointed to prepare a Heritage Assessment for the site. Initial research is underway and a site visit is due to take place during week commencing 9th April 2018. It is expected that the report will be completed and submitted to the Parish Council by the end of April 2018. The report will assess the relationship between the site and identified heritage assets such as the Conservation Area, and nearby Scheduled Monument.	and that a copy of the Focus Report be placed on the NP website. It is also recommended that the Development Brief that has been prepared for the site be modified to incorporate all of the detailed recommendations made in this report. We have now received a copy of this Report. This assessment investigates the known and potential heritage assets which may be affected by a proposed development on Site 1. It concludes that, with the exception of some historic plough marks (identified from aerial photography), and the stone stile that is to be found at the southern end of the site (which marks the route of an historic footpath), there is no evidence of any significant archaeology on the site.	Policy 4 has been modified to incorporate the following additional requirement: "An archaeological assessment being undertaken in accordance with CP 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy." The Development Brief for the site has been modified to incorporate the details included in the Cotswold Archaeology Report. This can be found at Appendix 1 of the SNP.

			It suggests that further investigative work would be beneficial so as to better understand the archaeological potential and significance within the Site boundary. A settings assessment undertaken as part of this report concluded that there will be no harm to the significance of heritage assets surrounding the Site as a result of the proposed development, including Sherston Conservation Area which runs along the southern boundary of the Site, and the Scheduled earthwork c. 40m south of the Site. It is recommended that a copy of this Report is placed on the SNP website and that Policy 4 is modified to incorporate an additional requirement requiring the submission of a Archaeological Assessment in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP58.	

		Landscape Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) have been appointed to prepare a baseline Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the site. A site visit has been carried out and it is anticipated that the final report will be completed and submitted to the Parish Council my mid-April 2018. Initial findings suggest that subject to appropriate landscaping and sensitive design, development can be bought forward in this location in a way that minimises the landscape and visual impacts.	It is also recommended that the Development Brief that has been prepared for the site be modified to incorporate the detailed recommendations made in the Report. We have now received a copy of this Report. This concludes that: "1. The site lies within the Cotswolds AONB which bestows a high degree of sensitivity on both its character and visual amenity of receptors in the landscape around it. The site does, however, have a strong relationship with the existing settlement and, in the context of the need to provide further housing in the village, appears to have a degree of support as a housing allocation within the draft Neighbourhood Plan. 2.Perhaps of the greatest noteworthiness is the potential	Policy 4 has been amended to make specific reference to the need to minimise the impact of any development on this site on the existing PROW. A Development Brief has been prepared for Site 1 which incorporates additional information contained in the EDP Report (see copy at Appendix 1 of the SNP). The Basic Conditions Statement has been modified to take account of

			for the western edge of any development of the site to become visible on the skyline in views from the wider landscape to the west, particularly around Sopworth. At present, receptors here are aware of the location of Sherston in the landscape due to the visibility of the church tower and water tower. However, currently, the main body of housing of the village is not visible in these views. As such, in designing the scheme, care needs to be taken to the design of development in the north western quadrant of the site in particular and mitigation along the western edge should be significant and trees incorporated into the development parcels here to break down massing. 3.On this basis, and if most of the recommendations set out above can be integrated into the scheme, it should be possible to develop a scheme which provides new housing and other village facilities while respecting the sensitivity of the site and thereby	the additional information contained in this report

			minimising adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Any future planning application for the site should be informed by this baseline report and proposals should be assessed against this in the form of a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Such a sensitive approach to the scheme should then be capable of satisfying the third bullet point of paragraph 116 of the NPPF (as referenced at Section 2 of this report) and, subject to the other paragraph 116 'tests' being met, the scheme should be acceptable in landscape and visual terms." Policy 4 already seeks to ensure that the impact of this proposed development on the AONB is minimised. It is recommended however that the information contained in this Report be used to assist in the preparation of the Basic Conditions Statement and that the Development Brief is modified to incorporate any	

			appropriate detailed recommendations.	
		Transport Miles White Transport (MWT) have been appointed to prepare a Transport Statement.	We have now received a copy of this Report.	
		The initial assessment of the site has confirmed that vehicular access will be taken from Sopworth Lane (Green Lane) via a new priority T junction. The work will include the collection of traffic survey data will need to be gathered outside of the current school holiday period. The Transport Statement will therefore be completed and submitted to the Parish Council by the end of April 2018.	None of the information supplied in this Report contradicts that provided in the earlier prepared Arup Report.	None required. No change. A Development Brief has been prepared for the site – see copy at Appendix 1 of the SNP. This makes use of both the Arup and MWT Reports
		POLICY 4 The site is referred to as 'Sopworth Road' (para 8.4.20), 'Sopworth Lane' (para 8.2.24) and 'West of Knockdown Road' (Policy 4). LRM Planning's submission on behalf of APG referred to the site at 'Land at Upper Stanbridge Farm'. It is a point of detail, but to avoid confusion the site should be referred to consistently in the Plan.	Comments noted and agreed. Recommend that all references to the individual sites be made consistent. To be named as follows: Site 1 – Sopworth Lane Site 2 – The Vicarage	The SNP has been amended to provide a consistent name for this and all of the other sites.
		Both the policy and the accompanying		

		text make reference to Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy Policy 43: Providing Affordable Housing. The policy sets out when affordable housing will be required and indicates the proportions which will be sought from open market housing development. For the area in question Policy 43 sets an affordable housing target of 40% and this is reflected in Policy 4 of the neighbourhood plan. However, in addition to setting the target the policy also states: The provision of affordable housing may vary on a site-by-site basis taking into account evidence of local need, mix of affordable housing proposed and, where appropriate, the viability of the development. Whilst referred to in the text preceding Policy 4 (paragraph 8.4.14) this part of the Core Strategy Policy 43 should also be included within the neighbourhood plan policy. The February 2017 Development Appraisal Report provided by Seymour Chartered Surveyors is helpful in that it demonstrates that a scheme is achievable	Site 3 – The Elms Comments noted. LRM made this same point prior to publication of the draft SNP. The Steering Group took advice from Wiltshire Council about this issue at the time. They advised that it was unnecessary to amend the wording of the policy itself given that Policy 4 of the SNP has to be read in conjunction with Core Strategy Policy 43. Para 8.4.14 of the draft SNP makes this point. No change recommended.	No change.

		in this location. However, the viability of the proposed development will be a matter for thorough consideration at the time of a planning application. At that time full details of the size and cost associated with the GP surgery, the proposed mix of house sizes and types on the site, the full impact of any identified constraints and the requirements in terms of land for the various uses identified on the site will be known. Whilst APG remain confident about the deliverability of the overall scheme at this stage, it important in the interests of clarity for the local community that Core Strategy Policy 43 and the considerations within are explained. Proposals Map 7 accompanying Policy 4 should be updated to incorporate an additional strip of land to the north of the western boundary. This land (see the attached site location plan) is proposed for allocation in order to provide additional scope to incorporate landscaping measures.	Noted but not agreed. The village has previously expressed concern about the scale of development	No change.

		SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL The Sustainability Appraisal considers a number of potential options for future development to meet the objectives set out in the Plan. The appraisal assesses all of the sites that were considered against thirteen separate criteria. The assessment of Site 1 concludes that development in this location will result in 'significant positive' effects under four categories; Population and Housing, Inclusive Communities, Education and Skills and Economy and Enterprise. The site was also assessed in terms of Transport as being 'significant positive'. And a further five criteria were assessed as having either neutral, no or uncertain effects; Land and Soil Resources, Water Resources and Flood Risk, Air Quality and	on this site. Should the developer wish to purchase additional land from the landowner so as to facilitate additional landscaping to the west of the site this could presumably be done without the need for expanding the allocated site area. An increase in the allocated site area could open the door to unnecessary additional development. No change recommended. Noted and agreed.	None required.

		Environmental Pollution, Climatic Factors, Historic Environment. The site was assessed as having an uncertain effect in terms of impact on Healthy Communities. We question the methodology employed for this element of the appraisal. Whilst community facilities including the GP surgery are referred to in the Inclusive Communities sustainability objective, the approach taken does not consider the role that the GP service will undoubtedly play in facilitating a healthy community. The 'sustainability objectives' set out in Table 3 should be revised to reflect this and the sites re-assessed accordingly. In our view the fact that development of Site 1 will provide an new facility and secure the provision of GP services in Sherston must be considered as having a positive impact on the health of the community.	Noted and agreed. Comments noted but not agreed. The criteria utilised for assessing this issue in the SA was set out from the outset in the original draft SEA. These were in turn based on similar criteria used by both WC and others when preparing their Sustainability Assessments. It is not considered appropriate to change the criteria at this stage of the process to accommodate this suggestion. This particular element is currently scored under the "Community" objective. If the criteria were to be changed this would necessitate re-evaluating all of the other option sites that were considered during the site selection process. Whilst agreeing with the proposition	None required. No change.

		Biodiversity was assessed as having a 'neutral effect'. As outlined above the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has revealed that there are no immediate ecological constrains for the site and that no further specialist surveys will be required. The development of Site 1 in fact offers opportunities for ecological enhancement through potential measures such as hedgerow planting, landscaping and the inclusion of bat and bird boxes in the scheme. In light of this Site 1 can be considered to result in positive effects in terms of this sustainability objective and should be re-assessed accordingly.	that the provision of new GP services would have a "positive impact on the health of the community" it is not considered necessary or appropriate to change the criteria in the manner suggested. No change recommended. The Ecology report (prepared by Focus) does suggest that this element could have been given a better score – particularly taking into account the potential enhancement measures that could be undertaken. In the absence of a similar more detailed assessment being undertaken of all of the original option sites the advice that has been received from Wiltshire Council is to leave the SA unchanged. It is acknowledged however that the impact of this proposed development on "biodiversity" is most probably likely to be less than first anticipated.	No change.

		In terms of Landscape Site 1 has been assessed as being 'significant negative'. Such a conclusion is clearly premature in the absence of any technical evidence. As confirmed above a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is currently under preparation and will be submitted to the Parish Council in the near future. Initial findings are that, with appropriate mitigation and design, the site can be developed in a sensitive manner. This assessment will include recommended approaches to the design of any future scheme which will minimise the landscape and visual effects and provide mitigation for its anticipated effects. The Sustainability Appraisal should reconsider the proposal on receipt of this evidence. It is noted that Paragraph 5.31 of the Sustainability Appraisal also confirms community support for the allocation of the site stating: It is a matter of record that the village opted overwhelmingly to support a proposal to release the whole of Site 1 for mixed use development.	No change recommended. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal Report prepared by EDP similarly suggest that this element could also have been given a better score. The same advice from WC noted above however applies here. The information contained in this report is nevertheless very helpful. It is recommended that the details contained in this report be used when Preparing the Basic Conditions Report and be incorporated as appropriate into the Development Brief that has been prepared for the site. Noted.	The Basic Conditions Statement and Development Brief for this site have been amended to take account of the information contained in this report. None required.

		In conclusion, the Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that Site 1 is sustainable and a suitable location for future development. The site also scores significantly higher than the other options considered for allocation. This provides clear and robust evidence in support for the decision to allocate the site. **CONCLUSION** The evidence submitted in support of the Draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates that the site is suitable for development and achievable. The site is also available and, subject to the appropriate planning permission, can be brought forward in the short term. Importantly, Site 1 is also supported by the local community. Subject to the comments outlined in this letter, APG confirm their support for the	Noted and agreed. Noted and agreed. Noted.	None required. None required. None required.

		principle of the allocation of Site 1 in the Draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan. APG welcome and encourage further discussion with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering throughout the remainder of the plan's preparation. It is anticipated that a number of consultation comments will be related to Site 1 and we request sight of these at the earliest possible opportunity. This will assist in identifying whether it is necessary to commission any additional technical work in support of the proposed allocation.	Noted. (N.B. A meeting has been held with LRM to discuss their comments - at which all of the other comments made in relation to the Sopworth Lane site were given to them).	None required.
Wiltshire Council	Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, Wiltshire BA14 8JN	**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** The draft Sustainable Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) provides a clear and equivalent assessment of the reasonable options considered for allocation in the plan. The final SA report will ensure the SNP contributes to sustainable development and is compatible with EU regulation. The Council would welcome a	A meeting was held with officers of Wiltshire Council to discuss all of their comments. Recommended changes to take account of their comments are noted below. This matter has been discussed with Wiltshire Council. A Habitats Regulation Assessment of the NP	A copy of the Habitats Regulation Assessment report prepared by WC has been placed on the website. The Basic Conditions Statement has been amended to take account of

		discussion about the role of Habitats Regulation Assessment as the SNP moves forward to the next stage.	has since been undertaken by the Council. This concludes that the proposals contained in the plan will have "no significant effect".	this information.
		GENERAL		
		The SNP usefully recognises the context provided by national policy and local policies within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the North Wiltshire Local Plan.	Noted.	None required.
		The draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (HSAP) was published for consultation in 2017. The consultation documents included proposals to amend the settlement boundary for Sherston. Acknowledgement of this parallel process is welcomed in the draft SNP.	Noted.	None required.
		For ease of reference and identity it might to be useful to name each policy. For example: Policy 4: West of Knockdown Road, Policy 5: The Vicarage.	Noted and agreed. Recommend naming each policy in manner suggested. Site 1 – Sopworth Lane Site 2 – The Vicarage Site 3 – The Elms	The SNP has been amended in accordance with this suggestion. Each Policy has been given a separate title and each site identified by name.
		PHYSICAL CONTEXT		

		It is recognised that historic assets are included in the SA: 'Objective 8 - Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment – with particular reference to the designated ancient monument, the two Conservation Areas and all listed buildings' and as such the importance of historic assets in the village is embedded in the site selection process. However, the section on physical context could be strengthened by reference to the importance of the village's location in relation to the Fosse Way Roman road and to the substantial Roman villa excavated at Vancelletes Farm in the 1980s. **OBJECTIVES** A number of minor wording changes are suggested as follows: Objective 4 Social rented housing is no longer a tenure that is sought from new developments by housing enablers. For clarity the word 'social' could be removed from the objective and instead just refer	Noted. Recommend amending Section 4 as suggested to include a specific reference to the Roman period. Recommend amending objective 4 as suggested.	The SNP has been amended to include an additional paragraph relating to this period of history – see Para 4.3. The wording of Objective 4 has been amended as

		to affordable rented housing Objective 7, bullet 2 Could this be expanded to include the historic environment and archaeological features? Objective 8, bullet 2 Some alternative energy sources can have unintended consequences e.g. particulates from wood burners, N02 from backup generators. A minor wording amendment to bullet 2 may help avoid this e.g. "encouraging the appropriate introduction of alternative energy sources". **Policy 1** Policy 1 usefully defines the community services and facilities that are to be protected in accordance with Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 49. Core Policy 35 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy protects existing employment	 Recommend expanding Objective 7 by adding in reference as suggested. Recommend amending Objective 8 as suggested. **Policy 1** Support for this policy noted and welcomed.	suggested – it now refers to "affordable rented housing". The wording of objective 7 has been amended as suggested. The wording of Objective 8 has been amended as suggested. None required.

		sites in Principal Settlements, Market Towns and Local Service Centres. It does not extend to large villages. Policy 1 extends the same protection afforded to community services and facilities to named business in Sherston in order to maintain local employment and will supplement Core Policy 35. This is supported. **Policy 2** As identified in the SNP, Policy 2 will supplement Wiltshire Core Policy 51 by providing local information about the open spaces to be protected. **Policy 3** The Government have recently published proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 10 of the amended document relates to supporting high quality communications and states 'policies should set out how high quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time'. Policy 3	**Policy 2** Comments noted. **Policy 3** A meeting has been held with Wiltshire Council to discuss these comments. It seems that few if any Neighbourhood Plans have successfully incorporated a Policy dealing with this issue (and none as yet in Wiltshire). It was felt however that the Policy as drafted was entirely in	None required. No change.

		therefore reflects the intention of emerging government guidance. However, this is not confirmed guidance. Policies in NPs that relate to broadband have been deleted through examination in neighbourhood plans in Wiltshire. It is suggested, therefore, that further research on the use of policies for broadband in NPs is undertaken so that the policy can be amended to reflect best practice and ensure delivery through the planning application process.	accordance with both current and emerging NPPF policy guidance and hence it was deemed worthwhile seeking to retain this policy as drafted in the SNP. Alternative options have been considered – including amending the wording of this policy to simply make direct reference for the need for new development in the SNP to be compatible with the NPPF but this is felt to be too loose and less likely to be acceptable. Recommend – no change.	
		Section 4 (New Build Development) The supporting text to these policies usefully provides the policy context and the background to the sites included in the plan.	Noted.	None required.
		It would also be helpful to add reference to the process of site selection that was undertaken through the sustainability appraisal and then judgements made to	Recommend adding a paragraph in the supporting text cross-referencing the site selection	An additional paragraph

		conclude that the three allocated sites were the most appropriate for the village. It is particularly important to identify how the policies seek to address any threats or weakness relating to the site identified through the SA process	process as follows: "A rigorous site selection process was undertaken to identify the most appropriate deliverable, viable and sustainable locations for each of the various different types of development that it was considered would be needed to meet the underlying objectives of the plan. Full details of this process are to be found in the Sustainability Assessment document that accompanies the plan."	(8.4.20) has been added to Section 8 of the SNP. This states that: "A rigorous site selection process was undertaken to identify the most appropriate deliverable, viable and sustainable locations for each of the various different types of development that it was considered would be needed to meet the underlying objectives of the plan. Full details of this process are to be found in the Sustainability Assessment document that accompanies the plan."
		It should be noted that the 2012 Rural Housing Needs Survey was a snapshot in time used to inform the development of the SNP and that housing need will be based on all credible evidence at the time a planning application is submitted.	Noted.	None required.
		Please note that, on page 22, the reference to the council waiting list could be changed to council housing register or	Recommend amending text as suggested.	Para 8.4.30 of the SNP has

		Homes 4 Wiltshire register. **Policy 8** Reference to school travel is supported and as most primary school pupils live within a ½ mile of school there should be a focus on their school travel plan and how to reduce travel by car. Paragraph 8.4.33 refers to the use of CIL to secure the improvements sought through policy 8. It may be useful in the supporting text to clarify that this is a priority project for the use of CIL receipts received by Sherston Parish Council as this project is not currently on the Wiltshire Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 List, September 2016. **Policies 9, 10 and 11** Leisure Services agrees with the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan submission with particular interest and support for	Noted. This is an item that has previously been identified as a priority by the Steering Group – along with much needed improvements to local sports facilities. Recommend adding a short section into the SNP dealing specifically with CIL priorities. Support noted and welcomed.	been amended as suggested. None required. An additional Section (Section 6) has been added to the SNP setting out the CIL payment priorities. Following a discussion about the use of CIL payments at the Steering Group meeting it was agreed to add a reference to the possibility of utilising CIL funding for any necessary improvements to the Primary school site deriving from the other proposals in the NP. None required.

		policies 2, 9, 10 and 11.		
David Stuart Historic England	29 Queen Square, Bristol, BS1 4ND	**Policy 4** **West of Knockdown Road** 3.2 ha of land north of and immediately adjoining the Conservation Area and the Scheduled Earthwork. The policy proposes a new GP surgery with parking, potential for expansion of the school, and up to 45 dwellings. The Foxley Tagg Report covering Site Assessments asserts that there will be no impact upon cultural heritage and that it would represent an appropriate extension of the village envelope with minimal visual impact (p69,70). The table on p100 asserts that the impact on archaeology is unknown/no information. Overall the Report provides no evidence to substantiate its assertions. The report on the site by LRM Planning	**Policy 4** Since receiving these comments we have received a Heritage Assessment prepared by Cotswold Archaeology for the Sopworth Lane site. This assessment investigated "the known and potential heritage assets" which may be affected by a proposed development on Site 1. The main conclusions were as follows: 1. The known archaeological resource identified in the area surrounding the Site is	**Policy 4** A Development Brief has been prepared for Site 1 (which incorporates the conclusions and recommendations as set out in the Cotswold Archaeology Heritage Assessment) which has been incorporated into the NP. The wording of Policy 4 has been modified to take account of the heritage issues raised in that report and to make specific reference to the Development Brief. The Basic Conditions Statement has been modified to incorporate appropriate references to the Cotswold Archaeology

		Ltd confirms the location of the conservation area to the south east as a key issue and the statutory obligations to protect and enhance which exist. Reference is made to the need to consider this requirement through any planning application but there is no evidence of investigation to establish the role the site plays in defining the setting of the conservation area and thereby the in-principle suitability of the site for development. It is therefore not clear how the report is able to conclude that development is unlikely to have any significant impact on the conservation area (para 5.19, p13). Reference is also made to the need for a desk-based assessment to inform on below ground archaeological remains but there has apparently been no preliminary scoping to determine the archaeological potential of the site and whether this should inform the allocation in principle or the manner in which development is pursued. The Sustainability Appraisal includes a table (4A, p26) in which the site has been appraised against the Historic	characterised largely by the known settlement in Sherston, which was established in the early medieval and expanded during the medieval period and through to the present day. In addition, a Scheduled earthwork is located a short distance to the south of the Site which existing interpretations suggest may be remnants of a Norman ringwork/castle, part of the medieval settlement, or an early medieval defensive earthwork associated with the suggested site of a Saxon battle nearby. 2. Historic aerial photography showing plough marks within part of the Site, as well as much of the land around the settlement, suggests that much of this area was farmland from at least the medieval period onwards. Any remnant agricultural features such as furrows or ditches would not be of more than low heritage significance. 3. The wider area contains	report.

		Environment. A score of 6 is given but it is not clear what methodology has been used to arrive at this outcome in terms of demonstrating an understanding of the significance of relevant heritage assets. There is no reference to a heritage analysis on pp 24 or 28 though Table 15 (p51) concludes that there is no intervisibility between the site and the Scheduled Monument, it is well outside the conservation area and well away from any listed buildings, and with no evidence of on-site archaeological interest. However, these observations do not in themselves mean that there will be no impact on the settings of these heritage assets. There is no reference to the Conservation Area Statement; one is not included within the schedule of available documents and we were unable to locate or otherwise access a copy online. We are not sufficiently familiar with the area to be able to offer informed comment ourselves but it is distinctly a possibility that the open and undeveloped nature of the site plays an important part in defining the strategic setting of the	evidence of prehistoric and Roman activity, although this is infrequent and largely untested, with none in close proximity to the Site. There is thus some limited potential for currently unrecorded remains of this date within the Site. 4.There is no specific evidence for remains associated with the Scheduled medieval earthwork to the south of the Site to extend to the north into the Site. The southernmost part of the Site has obviously a greater potential for any such possible associated features. 5. Further, it is advised that a stone access stile which marks the route of the historic footpath (still in use) on the southern boundary of the Site is retained (Fig. 14); while it is not of high heritage value, it does contribute positively to the setting of the Conservation Area. 6. It is suggested that further investigative work would be beneficial in order to better understand the archaeological	

		conservation area and that of the Scheduled Earthwork. We do not necessarily dispute that the site represents the best option for the development in question but the specific nature and quantum of this appears to have been determined primarily by the need to achieve viability, other constraints, as well as community aspirations. Even though the legitimate outcome of an SEA exercise may conclude that some level of (harmful) impact is justified this needs to be based on an appropriate level of robust, in this case heritage, evidence. We would therefore advise that the assertions referred to in the documents above are substantiated accordingly.	potential and significance within the Site boundary, in line with Core Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. This may initially comprise of a geophysical survey; the results of which can inform the need and extent of further proportionate and appropriate work. 7. A settings assessment undertaken as part of this report has concluded that there will be no harm to the significance of heritage assets surrounding the Site as a result of the proposed development, including Sherston Conservation Area which runs along the southern boundary of the Site, and the Scheduled earthwork c. 40m south of the Site. The development would therefore be implemented in accordance with Core Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Paragraph 132 of the NPPF, with regard to	

			the setting of heritage assets. A copy of this Report was forwarded to Historic England with the request that further consideration be given to this issue. The following response was received: “This is a helpful document in that it specifically addresses the heritage issues we have previously identified for this site. The question then is whether it’s answers are deemed reasonable outcomes of the analysis which has been undertaken. As I have indicated before, our assessment of such reports is limited by a lack of familiarity with the area. My inclination from the Heritage Assessment is to feel that the heritage	

			significance in the form of the respective settings of the Scheduled earthwork and Conservation Area are bound up as one; the earthwork was created as a defensive structure to protect the settlement from the northwest and this understanding may also inform the strategic setting of the conservation area from this quarter. Such value may apply regardless of the fact that some development has taken place between the conservation area and the site in question. The latter's rural nature and role as part of a larger "natural" and undeveloped context may therefore be a significant aspect of that setting. I am therefore obliged to defer to those with more local knowledge and expertise – namely Wiltshire Council's conservation officer and County Archaeologist. You indicate that you will be meeting with the Council on one of the	

			other proposed development sites and it seems sensible to use this opportunity to run all the sites in question past its heritage experts to establish definitively whether there are any reasons why the allocations in principle within the Plan and the specific forms of development where proposed should not be allowed. Our role is not to substitute for or duplicate the role of the Council in this respect and we would be happy to defer to the advice of its heritage experts, thus simplifying the process for all concerned." A meeting was held with the Wiltshire Council's Conservation Officer to discuss the views expressed by Historic England and more particularly to establish whether the Council took the view that any of the proposed allocated sites should not be developed. All of the proposed development sites were	

			discussed. After some discussion it was agreed that, provided that a Development Brief was prepared for each of the proposed housing sites – Sites 1, 2 and 3 – which took into account all of the known site constraints and opportunities (including the heritage issues) this should, if deemed satisfactory, overcome any heritage concerns. A Development Brief was therefore prepared for each site – a copy of which was forwarded to the WC Conservation Officer for his comments and approval. He replied on 31st July 2018 as follows: "In general, the combination of the text and illustrations (shown in the Development Briefs) explains the context and demonstrates an understanding of the heritage constraints.	

			In general, I am content that the suggested revisions are sufficient together with the analysis of the Vicarage site to address the issues previously raised by HE and subsequently discussed with the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan Team. The key constraints are now documented and issues identified in order that the capacity and characteristics of the sites can be adequately understood". Taking into account the fact that the WC Conservation Officer is content with all three of the proposed allocations from a heritage viewpoint, provided that the Development Briefs that have been prepared are incorporated into the NP, it is recommended that: 1.This policy be retained but amended where necessary to	

			take account of the guidance contained in the Cotswold Archaeology report. 2. The Development Brief prepared for the site be incorporated into the SNP 3. The Basic Conditions Statement amended to incorporate relevant references to the Cotswold report.	
		Policy 5 **Vicarage Site** The site lies within the conservation area and the setting of the Grade 1 Church of the Holy Cross. The policy proposes additional burial space and about 3 new dwellings including a replacement vicarage. The Foxley Tagg Report identifies the potential for visual impact upon the church on pp87/88 but makes no reference of the conservation area	**Policy 5** Since receiving these comments we have received a Heritage Assessment prepared by Border Archaeology for this site. The findings of the Report can be summarised as follows:	**Policy 5** A Development Brief has been prepared for Site 2 (which incorporates the conclusions and recommendations as set out in the Border Archaeology Heritage Assessment) which

		(though does on p111). It also confirms the existence of archaeological potential but is uncertain what this might be (pp103, 106 & 111). The Sustainability Appraisal table 4A (p27) gives the site a low heritage score of 2, reflecting the likelihood of some harm but falling short of being deemed a Significant Negative Score. The description of the site on pp 29 & 30 identifies the Grade II former Vicarage as an additionally relevant designated heritage asset along with several listed monuments in the churchyard. The open and undeveloped character of the site is considered to form part of the setting of the church and large scale development would have a significant adverse impact on it and the character of the conservation area. However, small scale development was considered acceptable. Table 15 on p51 and para 5.41 on p56 add that good design could mitigate any potential negative impact. The replacement of the existing modern vicarage is unlikely to be an issue in	**Archaeological Assessment**: Prehistoric and Roman: The potential for encountering deposits and features of prehistoric or Romano-British date has been assessed as **Low**, reflecting the lack of recorded evidence for activity of this date within the site. Medieval: The potential for encountering medieval remains has been assessed as **Moderate to High**, reflecting the fact that the site appears to lie partially within the eastern extent of a large ditched enclosure that may represent evidence of a fortified settlement of early medieval date. There is potential to encounter buried remains of the enclosure itself and occupation features and deposits associated with the early medieval settlement of Sherston. Post-Medieval: The potential for encountering evidence of post-medieval remains has been	has been incorporated into the NP. The wording of Policy 5 has been modified to take account of the heritage issues raised in that report and to make specific reference to the Development Brief. The Basic Conditions Statement has been modified to incorporate appropriate references to the Border Archaeology report.

		principle and the extension of the existing churchyard to cater for future needs a logical step which is consistent with the existing setting of the church. However, even the addition of only 2 extra dwellings could have a significant effect on the setting of the listed church and the prevailing character of the conservation area and it cannot be assumed that such a seemingly modest level of development will not cause harm. We would therefore recommend that the setting of the church and relevant listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area in this location be understood more fully to inform the basis of the policy. In the absence of a clear case for such housing in this location from a public benefits perspective it is not clear how any harm can be justified.	assessed as **Low**, reflecting the fact that the site has been occupied as pasture since the 19th century and as a garden plot associated with the existing Vicarage since 1969. **Built Heritage Assessment:** The potential impact of the proposed development on nearby listed heritage assets has been assessed as being in the **Slight to Moderate** range. This overall assessment reflects the fact that the site of the proposed development is located within the designated Conservation Area of Sherston, an historic settlement with a well-preserved street pattern dating back to the medieval period and a fine collection of 16th-19th century houses, many of which are listed buildings. More specifically, the site contains the remains of a Grade II listed medieval churchyard cross	

			(relocated to the Vicarage garden in the late 20th century) and is situated in a sensitive location close to the Grade I listed medieval parish church of Holy Cross and immediately adjacent to the churchyard, which is distinguished by its substantial collection of pre-19th century funerary monuments (over 40 in number), most of which are Grade II listed in their own right. The Old Vicarage, a Grade II listed house of 17th century date, is also located to the southeast of the site. The proposed two new houses (in particular the new Vicarage house) will result in a discernible change to existing views of the church and churchyard; however, it may be argued that the new houses will only represent a peripheral intrusive element in these established views. The allocation of the southernmost portion of the Vicarage garden for an extension to the	

			churchyard will further provide a buffer zone between the new houses and nearby built heritage assets. Moreover, as a result of their sensitive design and with the implementation of appropriate landscape mitigation measures, it is considered that the impact of the new houses on the setting of specific built heritage assets and the Sherston Conservation Area can be significantly reduced. The overall conclusion being: "Based on the results of this Heritage Impact Assessment, informed by a detailed assessment of readily available archaeological and historical sources of information, the overall impact of the proposed development on the designated built heritage assets in the immediate vicinity (including the Sherston Conservation Area) has been assessed as being in the	

			Slight to Moderate range. While the two proposed houses are evidently situated in a highly sensitive and historically important location, within the historic core of Sherston, a well-preserved example of a shrunken medieval town, and in close proximity to the Grade I listed church of Holy Cross and its churchyard, it may be argued that they will only represent peripheral elements in established views of these important historic buildings and will not significantly detract from the integrity and coherence of these specific heritage assets or the wider Conservation Area of Sherston. Visual impacts will be further reduced by the sensitive design and positioning of the new houses and appropriate landscape mitigation." We wrote to Historic England as follows on the 26th July 2018:	

			"We have been in discussion with the Conservation Officer at Wiltshire Council – as you suggested – about all three of the proposed allocated development sites in the draft plan. Copies of your comments on the draft NP having been sent to WC in advance of that meeting. The Council had not previously raised any concerns from a conservation viewpoint to any of the proposed allocated sites. In short, after some discussion, we agreed to prepare a Development Brief for each site – taking into account heritage, landscape, highway, ecology and all other relevant matters. The Council considered that this was most probably the best way of dealing with your (or any similar) concerns. These have now been completed – following the receipt of a Heritage Assessment for the Vicarage site (Site 2 – Policy 5) which has been prepared by Border Archaeology. Please find attached a copy of their report for your information and	

			attention. You have already seen and commented upon a copy of the Cotswold Archaeology Report on Site 1 (Sopworth Lane). We are now awaiting the receipt of any feedback from the Council on both the latest Heritage Assessment and the three draft Briefs. " Historic England replied as follows on 27th July 2018: "The decision to prepare a development brief for each site implies that the suitability of each for development is deemed acceptable in principle. Our previous comments were essentially on this matter – heritage evidence to demonstrate their in-principle suitability where new allocations are being suggested, and to substantiate development quota where these are being promoted.	

			We assume from this that the Council's conservation officer/County Archaeologist has therefore stated that they are happy with all of the above. If so, given our willingness to defer to their advice, I am not sure what added value is felt to come from preparing briefs at this moment in time? Evidence need only be proportionate and I wouldn't want our advice to be misinterpreted and possibly unnecessary work undertaken. At the same time, briefs will be useful in the future anyway to help guide development so will not be wasted." As reported (in our comments on Policy 4 noted above), the Council's Conservation Officer responded as follows to the receipt of the Border Archaeology Heritage Assessment (for the Vicarage Site) and the three Development Briefs that had been prepared on his recommendation:	

			"In general, the combination of the text and illustrations (shown in the Development Briefs) explains the context and demonstrates an understanding of the heritage constraints. In general, I am content that the suggested revisions are sufficient together with the analysis of the Vicarage site to address the issues previously raised by HE and subsequently discussed with the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan Team. The key constraints are now documented and issues identified in order that the capacity and characteristics of the sites can be adequately understood". Taking into account the fact that the WC Conservation Officer is content with all three of the proposed allocations from a heritage viewpoint, provided that	

			the Development Briefs that have been prepared are incorporated into the NP, it is recommended that: 1.This policy be retained but amended where necessary to take account of the guidance contained in the Border Archaeology report. 2. The Development Brief prepared for the site be incorporated into the SNP 3. The Basic Conditions Statement amended to incorporate relevant references to the Border Archaeology report.	
		Policy 6 **Green Lane/Sandpits Lane junction** The site lies immediately to the north of the conservation area and the policy proposes about 4 houses of a design and	**Policy 6** Wiltshire Council has raised no objection to the proposed allocation of this site from a "heritage" viewpoint. Indeed, it is a site that was first allocated for	**Policy 6** A Development Brief has

		layout consistent with its character. The Foxley Tagg Report states that there will be no impact upon cultural heritage (pp89 & 111) but identifies that there is a lack of knowledge or information on the site's archaeological potential (p106). The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site 6 against heritage considerations (p27), reaffirming its existence outside the conservation area and "well away from any listed buildings" though not identifying which these might be. The Appraisal also highlights that the site was previously allocated for housing in the North Wiltshire Local Plan. The principle of development having been established the issue is then whether the site can accommodate the level of development proposed without causing harm to designated heritage assets. If the policy provision does not exceed that made by the previous allocation we are happy with the safeguards it makes for protecting the setting of the conservation area.	development by their predecessor Local Planning Authority in the adopted North Wiltshire Local Plan. It is an extant allocation. The scale of development envisaged on the site is no greater than that assumed when the site was first allocated for development. The comments made by Historic England have nevertheless been discussed with the Wiltshire Council Conservation Officer. His advice was the same as for the other two proposed allocated sites – i.e. to prepare a development brief that dealt with all of the relevant issues (including heritage matters). As noted above, we received the following written response from the Council on 31st July 2018: "In general, the combination of the text and illustrations (shown in the Development Briefs)	been prepared for Site 3 which has been incorporated into the NP. The wording of Policy 6 has been modified to take account of the heritage issues raised in that report and to make specific reference to the Development Brief.

			explains the context and demonstrates an understanding of the heritage constraints. In general, I am content that the suggested revisions are sufficient together with the analysis of the Vicarage site to address the issues previously raised by HE and subsequently discussed with the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan Team. The key constraints are now documented and issues identified in order that the capacity and characteristics of the sites can be adequately understood". Taking into account the fact that the WC Conservation Officer is content with all three of the proposed allocations from a heritage viewpoint, provided that the Development Briefs that have been prepared are incorporated into the NP, it is recommended that:	

		Overall We have addressed the historic environment issues concerning the site allocations in question in some detail to highlight the need to understand the significance of relevant heritage assets to a degree appropriate to the potential for (harmful) impact upon them in accordance with the provisions for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment in the NPPF. It is also important to bear in mind that policies allocating sites for development need to be deliverable, and whatever any residual heritage issues might be they should not be of sufficient import to bring into question the integrity of the evidence upon which they were based	1.This policy be retained. 2. The Development Brief prepared for the site be incorporated into the SNP 3. The Basic Conditions Statement amended to incorporate relevant references to any heritage matters. **Overall** A considerable amount of further work has been undertaken on the heritage issue since the preparation of the draft plan. This has included the preparation of full Heritage Assessments of both Site 1 and Site 2 and the preparation of a Development Brief for all three sites (taking into account the identified heritage and other issues). As noted above further guidance was sought from Historic England on receipt of the Heritage Assessments prepared for both the Sopworth Lane and Vicarage sites. In both cases HE responded	**Overall** Copies of the Heritage Assessments prepared by Cotswold Archaeology and Border Archaeology to be placed on the NP website. The development briefs prepared for Sites 1, 2 and 3 to be incorporated into the NP and the relevant policies modified as appropriate.

		and thereby their suitability. Based on the available evidence we do not believe that such a positive conclusion can at present be drawn. Our original response to the SEA Scoping Report consultation drew attention to our guidance on the setting of heritage assets and it is somewhat disappointing that this appears not to have been used in the site assessments. We are conscious that the current consultation is the culmination of much work on the part of your community which it no doubt carried out in good faith and of the dismay it might experience on being advised to undertake more. At the same time, the Plan in its demonstration of conformity with national and local planning policy needs to show with evidence that it has addressed relevant policies for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. Any additional work involved need not be	by stating that, given their lack of detailed knowledge of the proposed development sites, they were willing to defer to the advice received from Wiltshire Council's Conservation Officers. Wiltshire Council has not raised an objection to these proposed allocations from a heritage (or indeed any other) viewpoint. They did suggest however that a Development Brief be prepared for all three sites. This work has now been completed. The Council has since confirmed that it is content that the three prepared development briefs "demonstrate an understanding of the heritage constraints" sufficient to "address the issues previously raised by HE". It is recommended that copies of both of the formal Heritage Assessments that have been submitted be placed on the SNP website and that the Development Briefs prepared for each site be approved and incorporated into the SNP.	

		great but will depend on a sufficient understanding of the principles used for determining the significance of heritage assets. The simplest and most straightforward approach would be to secure confirmation from Wiltshire Council's conservation and archaeology teams that the impacts on heritage assets arising from the site allocation policies as drafted are acceptable, expert advice we would be happy to defer to. We would also be happy to review our position on the Plan on receipt of further evidence.		