

Laverstock and Ford Communities Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2036 Consultation Statement



Table of Contents

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement

1 Purpose	3
2 Background	3
3 Consultation in the development of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan	3
4 Regulation 14 Consultation	5

Appendix 1: Organisations contacted during Regulation 14 Consultation

1.1 Statutory Bodies	9
1.2 Local Businesses	10
1.3 Other Local Organisations:	11
1.4 Landowners and Agents	12

Appendix 2: Regulation 14 Consultation: Responses to Consultees' Comments and Follow Up Actions

1 Statutory Bodies

1.1 Wiltshire Council	13
1.2 Wiltshire Councillor A (submission 1)	27
1.3 Wiltshire Councillor A (submission 2)	30
1.4 Wiltshire Councillor B	31
1.5 Highways England	31
1.6 Wessex Water	32
1.7 Natural England	32
1.8 SGN	32
1.9 Historic England	34
1.10 National Grid	34
1.11 Environment Agency	34
1.12 Salisbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group/SCC	35

2 Local Organisations

2.1 Plymouth Brethren	39
2.2 Boscombe Down Aviation Collection	39

3 Landowners and Agents

3.1 Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust	40
3.2 Blue Fox/ Bloor Homes	40
3.3 Savills/Hallam	43
3.4 Ministry of Defence	46

4 Residents

4.1 Hampton Park Resident	47
4.2 Laverstock Resident A	47
4.3 Laverstock Resident B	47
4.4 Laverstock Resident C	48
4.5 Laverstock Resident D	49
4.6 Laverstock Resident E	49
4.7 Laverstock Resident F	49
4.8 Bishopdown Farm Resident	49
4.9 Riverdown Park Resident A	50
4.10 Riverdown Park Resident B	50
4.11 Longhedge Resident	50

Regulation 15 Consultation Statement

1 Purpose

This paper sets out the community engagement and consultation undertaken in support of the Laverstock and Ford Communities Neighbourhood Plan.

2 Background

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. In accordance with these regulations, this Consultation Statement:

- contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
- explains how they were consulted
- summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

This Consultation Statement consists of two sections:

- Consultation in the development of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan
- Regulation 14 Consultation.

3 Consultation in the development of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan

Our approach to community engagement and consultation had three main elements:

3.1 Raising awareness and encouraging participation in its preparation

This was progressed initially via:

- Articles in Parish newsletters and flyers
- Public meeting at Hampton Park Pavilion.

and led to the formation in November 2017 of a Steering Group (comprising local residents and Parish Councillors), which subsequently met on a frequent basis.

3.2 Collecting views of Parish communities about the Parish and its future development

This consisted of two stages:

a) Informal/qualitative approach (Feb 2018 – Jan 2019)

This was progressed via short talks/discussions by steering group members at more than a dozen events/meetings within the Parish where attendees were encouraged to give their views on:

- i) likes and dislikes about the parish
- ii) what would make the parish a better/ worse place to live
- iii) any other aspect of future development
- iv) draft Neighbourhood Plan vision statement and objectives.

b) More quantitative approach (Sept 2019 – Jan 2020)

This was the most important and wide-ranging part of the process and was progressed via a series of surveys undertaken among the various community groups as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Community group	Date	Target group	Survey format	No of paper forms sent out	Completed
Residents	Sept 2019	All Parish residents	Paper/online	4,000	552
Businesses	Oct/Nov 2019	All local businesses	Paper/online	130	35
Landowners	Jan 2020	All landowners with significant landholding	Paper	31	10
School students	Jan 2020	Secondary school students Years 9-11	Online	None	136

Details of the content and findings of these surveys are contained in Appendix 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and on the Parish Neighbourhood Plan website <https://www.lfcnp.co.uk> in the Supporting Evidence section of the Documents page.

3.3 Keeping communities informed

This was achieved via:

- Setting up a website specifically for the Parish Neighbourhood Plan, containing latest news, survey results, etc.
- Regular updates on progress in the bi-monthly Parish newsletter, including summaries of the results of the surveys.

A full record of community engagement activities/ events and publicity is available on the Parish Neighbourhood Plan website <https://www.lfcnp.co.uk> in the Supporting Evidence section of the Documents page.

3.4 The main outcomes from the Community engagement and consultation process (set out in Section 5 of the plan) formed the basis of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives (Section 6) and policies (Section 9). To provide a brief illustration of this relationship, Table 2 identifies the specific Neighbourhood Plan policy/policies which relate to each key finding.

Table 2

Main outcomes from Community engagement	Specific Policies* informed
The semi-rural nature of the Parish, proximity to and views of countryside and the open spaces / green spaces within the Parish were all highly valued	1,3
Any development within the parish should have low impact on the visual character of the landscape	1,3,5
Preference for only limited further development, using land already designated for development rather than greenfield sites	3
The balance between developed land, agricultural land, and public open space should always ensure that the semi-rural character of the parish is maintained	1,3
Old Sarum and Longhedge should remain a separate settlement, separated from Salisbury city by the current agricultural buffer	1

Any development in Laverstock, Milford and Ford should be limited to infill (1 or 2 houses per site)	1
The water meadows along the River Bourne should be protected against any type of development	3
The community owned open spaces, such as Castle Hill Country Park, should be legally protected from future development	4
Any development within or adjacent to the Old Sarum Airfield should not harm the historic setting of the Airfield Conservation Area	2
Dissatisfaction with virtually all amenities in the new developments at Old Sarum and Longhedge	7
Too much traffic on narrow roads, excessive speeds and dangerous/inconsiderate parking, especially near schools	6,7
Poorly rated cycle path network (by residents in Ford, Hampton Park and Longhedge, younger respondents (18-30), an families with children)	6

*Policy references:

- 1 Protection of the distinctive settlement pattern of the Parish
- 2 Old Sarum Airfield Conservation Area
- 3 Protection and enhancement of the distinctive landscape character, wildlife habitats and heritage assets
- 4 Designated Local Green Spaces
- 5 Design of future development
- 6 Development of a comprehensive, attractive network of footpaths and cycleways within the Parish
- 7 Improvements to infrastructure and amenities appropriate to the scale of specific future housing development

The landowners survey revealed considerable interest by landowners in promoting housing development on part of their land holdings. This raised a potential conflict between their aspirations and the views of local residents, reinforcing the need to show due diligence in the preparation of policies relating to the scale and location of housing development. This is reflected in our approach to the analysis of local housing need (see Appendix 5 of the draft plan for details) and the specially commissioned landscape sensitivity assessment (see Appendix 9).

In their comments on the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan, Wiltshire Council stated:

“It is clear that extensive community engagement has been undertaken in the lead up to this regulation 14 consultation on the LFNP. It is therefore considered that the steering group have provided sufficient opportunity for the local community to give their views on what the neighbourhood plan for Laverstock and Ford Parish should contain”.

4 Regulation 14 Consultation

4.1 Scope

In accordance with Regulation 14, the scope of consultation was extended to include Statutory Consultees as well as the local community. This consultation stage initially ran from 8 May to 2 July 2021, although it was extended beyond this date to allow for the late receipt of responses from Wiltshire Council and Salisbury City Council.

The pre-submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan was published on the Parish Neighbourhood Plan website at the start of the consultation period. Due to the impact of Covid restrictions, it was not practicable to make hard copies of the plan available for public viewing, although individual hardcopies were available on request.

The on-line availability of the plan and the opportunity to comment was publicised via:

- features in the Parish Newsletter, which was delivered to over 4,000 local residents and businesses
- posters around the Parish
- the Parish Neighbourhood Plan website and the Parish Council website
- posts to local Facebook groups.

Individuals, groups and organisations were invited to comment on the pre-submission version of the plan by:

- using the comments form on NP website
- sending written comments by post
- attending either of two Q&A sessions on Zoom, (which replaced public meetings and drop in sessions due to the impact of Covid restrictions).

During the consultation period, there were 983 visits to the Neighbourhood Plan website by 839 different users.

In addition to the general publicity given to public consultation, considerable efforts were made to contact the following:

- statutory bodies
- local businesses
- other local organisations
- local landowners (including land agents/trustees)

Invitations to comment were sent to a total of 244 organisations/individuals via one or more of email/post/flyers delivered to individual addresses. Table 3 presents a summary of the numbers contacted by type of consultee for the purposes of Regulation 14 consultation.

Table 3

Regulation 14 Consultation: methods of communication by type of consultee			
Type of consultee	Communication method	Number contacted	Number of comments received
Local Residents (Households)	Poster/newsletter/website	4,000*	11
Statutory Bodies	Email (based on list provided by Wiltshire Council)	23	12
Local Businesses	Email and/or flyer	147	1
Other Local Organisations	Email or flyer	35	1
Landowners and Agents	Email/letter	39	4
Total		4,244	29

Appendix 1 contains further details of organisations consulted.

4.2 Results of the Regulation 14 consultation

29 comments were received, each of which were logged and a response and follow-up actions (including revisions to the Neighbourhood Plan) were determined.

Appendix 2 sets out an analysis of each of the 29 comments received, together with the response and any follow-up action proposed by the NP Steering Group and endorsed by the Parish Council (the full text of these comments is available on the Parish Neighbourhood Plan website <https://www.lfcnp.co.uk> in in the Supporting Evidence section of the Documents page).

The main issues which emerged (and how they were addressed) are summarised as follows:

Section 8:

WC commented that opting not to allocate land for housing in the neighbourhood plan means that the neighbourhood area will not qualify for the three-year housing land supply requirement afforded by paragraph 14 of the NPPF. They therefore advised that the steering group carry out an assessment of whether there are any suitable opportunities for the neighbourhood plan to allocate a small-scale site (or sites) within the parish for housing.
How addressed: The Parish Council and the Steering Group had fully understood this and had considered the possibility of an allocation. However, the strategic allocations in the parish have and, for some time, will continue to supply affordable housing volumes considerably in excess of those required to meet local needs, and the recent opening of a care home in Longhedge supplements the care for the elderly already provided by homes in Milford and Old Sarum. Accordingly, no change was made to the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 1:

WC suggested a need for clearer identification of Green Space Buffers to help maintain separation between settlements within the Parish and between settlements and the Salisbury settlement boundary.

How addressed: an indicative map of Green Space Buffers (renamed as “Green Buffers”) was included in the revised plan.

WC suggested that policies relating to Old Sarum Conservation Area should be covered in a separate policy.

How addressed: new policy 2 covering Old Sarum Conservation Area was added to the revised plan.

Policy 2 (renumbered Policy 3 in the revised plan):

WC suggested that policies relating to Local Green Spaces should be covered in a separate policy.

How addressed: new Policy 4 covering Local Green Spaces was added to the revised plan.

A resident queried the omission of Whitebridge Spinney from the proposed set of designated Local Green Spaces

How addressed: on further consideration, Whitebridge Spinney was added to the proposed list of Local Green Spaces in the revised plan

Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust expressed concern about references to their land holding in the context of the designation of Local Green Spaces

How addressed: all references to the Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust land in this context were omitted from the revised NP.

Policy 3 (renumbered Policy 6 in the revised plan):

WC recommended provision of more protection for heritage assets if development were proposed.

How addressed: an additional section in Policy 4 specifically relating to heritage assets, based on wording suggested by Wiltshire Council, was included in the revised plan.

Policy 4 (renumbered Policy 6):

Salisbury City Council Neighbourhood Plan Group suggested inclusion of a number of improvements to the cycle path network.

How addressed: the list of priorities in the revised plan was amended in the light of these suggestions.

Policy 6

WC advised that the Inspector would not regard this as a Neighbourhood Plan policy and suggested that it became part of supporting text.

How addressed: the content of this policy was incorporated in the supporting text of Policy 5 (renumbered Policy 7 in the revised plan).

Policy wording and format:

WC highlighted a number of instances of statements which were aspirations rather than policies or were essentially supporting text.

How addressed: in the light of WC's comments, policies were reworded in the light of WC's suggestions and reformatted so that policy statements are now separated from supporting text.

Appendix 1: Organisations contacted during Regulation 14 Consultation

1.1 Statutory Bodies

Total contacted: 23 (all by email)

Organisation	Comments received
Wiltshire Council officers	Yes
Wiltshire Council Southern Area Board members	Yes
The Homes and Communities Agency	
Natural England	Yes
The Environment Agency	Yes
Historic England	Yes
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	
Highways England	Yes
Primary Care Trust	
NHS Wiltshire	
Wessex Water	Yes
Scottish and Southern Energy	
SGN	Yes
Vodafone	
BT	
National Grid	Yes
Sustrans	
Wiltshire Police	
Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue	
Salisbury City Council	Yes
Clarendon Parish Council	
Winterbourne Parish Council	
Durnford Parish Council	

1.2 Local Businesses

Total contacted (by email and/or flyer): 147

Method of contact	
Email (39)	Hand delivered flyer (132)
Blue Frontier IT Ltd*	All businesses in the following business parks in Old Sarum: Old Sarum Airfield Castlegate Business Park Centurian Centre Castlegate Business Centre Sarum Business Park Old Sarum Park/Portway Centre plus the following other businesses: One Stop,Laverstock Classic Fish Bar One Classic Aroma One Stop, Hampton Park Hampton Inn The Cooperative Food, Old Sarum
Sarum Graphics Ltd*	
The Roseberry Group Ltd*	
Lascar Electronics Ltd, UK*	
Boscombe Down Aviation Collection* Ltd	
Labelcraft UK Ltd*	
Trevor Peters Design*	
VP Motorcycles*	
Pulse Precision Limited*	
Spruce Services Ltd*	
Codeology Ltd*	
A C Wallbridge & Co Ltd*	
Moore-Wilson New Media Ltd*	
Rawlence and Browne*	
1st Self Access Storage Ltd*	
Wessex Medical Ltd*	
Reflex Moodys Ltd*	
Pelatech Group*	
Clipper Enterprises Ltd*	
LC Power Ltd*	
Motor Parts Direct*	
Rockvend Ltd*	
Castlegate Windows*	
Sandra Silk Business Services Ltd*	
Bishopdown Surgery and Pharmacy	
Assisi Travel Ltd	
Avonbourne Care Centre	
Old Sarum Manor Care Home	
Old Sarum Nursery School	
Bishopdown farm Dental Practice	
Bishopdown Farm Pre-school and Farm Friends	
Milford House Care Home	
Giant Steps Day Nursery	
Enovation Controls Ltd	
Duck Inn	
Two Bird Experiences & Education Ltd	
Blencowe Scaffolding Ltd	
Guyatts of Salisbury Limited	

Note: businesses (marked with an asterisk) received both an email and flyer, as they are located on a business park in Old Sarum

1.3 Other Local Organisations:**Total: 35**

Contact method	
Email	Hand delivered flyer
Wyvern College/St Edmund's School	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Old Sarum
St Joseph's Secondary School	Army Reserve Centre
St Andrew's Primary School	(Army Cadets), Old Sarum
Old Sarum Primary School	Alabare Development Centre
Greentrees School	
St Andrew's Church, Laverstock	
Old Sarum Community Enablers	
Milford Preservation Group	
Laverstock and Ford Sports Club	
St Andrews Baby and Toddler Group	
Yoga at Laverstock Village Hall	
1st Laverstock Scouts Group	
Old Sarum Scouts Group	
Laverstock Brownies	
Hampton Park Pavilion	
Café on the Green Toddler Group	
Café on the Green/Cafe Craft Club	
RAF Air Cadets	
Old Sarum and Longhedge	
Neighbourhood Watch	
FirstPort Property Services	
Old Sarum Community Centre	
New Sarum WI	
Laverstock WI	
Laverstock Ladies Open Group	
Laverstock Gardening Group	
Laverstock History Group	
FitSteps	
Flora Mundi	
Mothers Union Afternoon Group	
Spurgeons Little Learners	
Monday Monkeys	
Plymouth Brethren	

1.4 Landowners and Agents

Total contacted: 39

Contact method	
Email	Letter
Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust	Landowner A
River Bourne Community Farm	Landowner B
Velcourt Group plc	Landowner C
Hallam Land Management	Trustee A Eric Briggs Will Trust
Walden Homes Ltd	Trustee B Eric Briggs Will Trust
Old Sarum Airfield	Trustee A Estate of J M McEnhill
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	Trustee B Estate of J M McEnhill
Ministry of Defence	Landowner D
Persimmon	Landowner E
The Land Trust	Landowner F
Vistry Group	Clarendon Park Farms Ltd
Pegasus Group	Clarendon Park Estate Office
Star Planning	Landowner G
Savills	Landowner H
Benchmark Development Planning Ltd	Landowner I
	Landowner J
	Landowner K
	Landowner L
	Landowner M
	Landowner N
	Landowner O
	CB Skips Ltd
	Boswell Bros (Salisbury) Ltd
	FieldFare Farms

Appendix 2: Regulation 14 Consultation: Responses to Consultees' Comments and Follow Up Actions

1 Statutory Bodies

1.1 Wiltshire Council

The responses and actions listed below follow the format of the Wiltshire Council comment document "Reg14_WC response to draft Laverstock and Ford Communities Neighbourhood Plan.pdf" received by email on 10/08/2021. The sections of this document which require a response/follow up action are reproduced below, together with the responses and follow-up actions.

1. Context

Comments received:

No comments directly related to the content of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

Response: No response required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

2. The Basic Conditions

Comments received:

The independent examiner must assess whether a neighbourhood plan meets the following basic conditions:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, European Union (EU) obligations
- Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The examiner is also required to check whether the neighbourhood plan:

- has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body
- has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation

- meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area
- policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

The examiner must also consider whether the draft neighbourhood development plan is compatible with human rights.

Response: Based on discussions with WC, we consider that the Basic Conditions Statement, which we have prepared as required, provides the necessary evidence that our draft Neighbourhood Plan meets the above conditions.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

3. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and other EU obligations

Comments received (1):

It is a requirement under the Basic Conditions that neighbourhood plans must be subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening, and Appropriate Assessment where required. The HRA screening and Appropriate Assessment has now been carried out and is appended to this response.

Response: We thank WC for the screening which indicates that an HRA is not required.

Follow-up action: The BCS has been amended to refer to the screening outcome and the screening opinion document has been added to the supporting evidence in the documents section of the Neighbourhood Plan website.

Comments received (2):

The draft LFNP does not currently propose to allocate land for development, in addition to that already allocated in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Taking into account the conclusions of the HRA Screening it is recommended that SEA screening is also undertaken. A request for an SEA screening should be made by the parish council to Wiltshire Council.

Response: It was clarified that, provided the parish council have formally agreed, the SEA screening could be requested by the NP team.

Follow-up action: The SEA screening was formally requested and in the light of its findings:

- the BCS has been amended to refer to the screening outcome
- the screening opinion document has been added to the supporting evidence in the documents section of the Neighbourhood Plan website

Comments received (3):

If it is concluded that SEA is not required, it should be noted that any substantial changes made to the content of the neighbourhood plan following SEA Screening may nevertheless require that process to be repeated to ensure that such changes are SEA compliant.

Response: Noted.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4. Policy Context

Comments received:

The Policy Context includes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2018 (revised February 2019 and July 2021).

Response: The latest revision of the NPPF was noted.

Follow-up action. The copy of NPPF on website has been updated to July 2021 and the amendments relative to the February 2019 version have been reviewed.

5. The Laverstock and Ford Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The following tables follow the format used by Wiltshire Council in making their comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, with response and action columns added.

Plan Ref:	Summarised Wiltshire Council comments received	Response	Follow Up Action
Front Cover and title page	For the submission draft plan the front cover and title page of the document must include the plan period e.g. 2021 – 2036.	Agreed.	NP front cover and title page have been amended to include 2021-2036.
Section 5 page 6	It is therefore considered that the steering group have provided sufficient opportunity for the local community to give their views on what the neighbourhood plan for Laverstock and Ford Parish should contain.	Noted.	No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.
Section 6, pages 7 - 8	It is recommended, for the Regulation 16 submission draft neighbourhood plan, that coloured text boxes are used for the vision and objectives to ensure that they stand out from the supporting text. To help with cross-referencing within the document, it is suggested that the objectives are also numbered.	Agreed on the need for stand out of Vision and Objectives from supporting text and also on the value of improving ease of cross-referencing for Objectives. We will make appropriate amendments.	The formatting and referencing have been amended as appropriate.
Section 7.1.3	In the interests of clarity, Saved Policy S2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan specifically relates to retail development and should not therefore be applied to restrict the location of health care facilities where the provision of such facilities is required to meet the needs of a local community. If there is evidence to justify the provision of additional healthcare facilities within the parish, then the neighbourhood plan could include a policy to support delivery of those facilities.	The reference to Policy S2 was only related to the refusal of an Aldi supermarket in Longhedge. Our understanding was that the NHS objected to a pharmacy being provided.	The wording of this section has been reviewed to make it clearer. The situation regarding a pharmacy in Old Sarum/Longhedge was considered further, but no change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.
Section 7.2.2, pages 11 - 12	This section also includes discussion of the delivery of employment land. Perhaps the section title should reflect this?	Agreed.	Section title has been amended to include Employment Land.
	The longer-term impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on business and employment are not currently known. The same also applies to the impact of the pandemic on the likelihood of more existing office space and	Noted. In the WC LPR consultation video meeting in January 2021 it was stated that the review is currently at the scoping stage and the date for publishing	No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

	<p>employment land to be released for residential use. In order to better understand the latest position on this matter, Wiltshire Council intends to commission a review of employment needs in Wiltshire to inform the local plan review.</p>	<p>any conclusions is currently unknown. Until further evidence is available, we believe our statement in the Neighbourhood Plan is valid.</p>	
	<p>Equally, the retention of the Churchfields Industrial Estate as employment would not mean that this reduces the need for the provision of additional employment land elsewhere.</p>	<p>We do not understand this statement. It seems clear that moving businesses off Churchfields as originally planned would have increased the need for employment land elsewhere.</p>	<p>No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.</p>
<p>Section 7.2.3, first bullet point, page 13</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan makes little mention of flood risk to the community. Including further consideration of flood risk indicates an acknowledgement of those risks whilst presenting an opportunity for the community to say how they try and mitigate those risks e.g. preservation of the water meadows to reduce flood risk which would in turn protect open spaces and habitat.</p>	<p>We are not aware of a current significant flooding risk to properties in the Parish, only to roads, gardens and agricultural land. Based on the Environment Agency's current map of flood risk, it would appear only one residential property in the parish has a risk of flooding from the River Bourne greater than 0.1% However, we fully acknowledge the benefit of preserved water meadows in reducing flood risk generally, and particularly for downstream properties.</p>	<p>The flood mitigation benefits of the water meadows preservation/enhancement have been added to the supporting text of Policy 2 (now renumbered Policy 3).</p>
<p>Section 7.2.3, fifth bullet point, page 13</p>	<p>Against the Heritage Assets bullet point it might also be worth making reference to the relationship of the parish with Old Sarum Scheduled Monument, the historic importance of the Old Sarum Airfield and important views to the Salisbury Cathedral spire from within the parish.</p>	<p>The relationship to Old Sarum monument is covered in bullet 4 and the importance of Old Sarum Airfield in bullet 3. Agreed that views to Salisbury Cathedral should be highlighted as development constraint.</p>	<p>Wording of NP has been amended as appropriate.</p>
	<p>The main Plan document could do with a short section summarising the archaeological background of the parish where the bare</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Section 3 of the NP (The Neighbourhood Plan Area) has been amended to include a description of the historic context of the parish.</p>

	<p>bones of the data gleaned from the Wiltshire and Swindon historic Environment Record (WSHER) could be fleshed out and discussed in more detail, placing the parish within its archaeological context in the landscape of South Wiltshire.</p>		
	<p>There is also a slight issue with heritage assets/important areas of landscape character being defined as development constraints. While they do present challenges to future growth and development, they can also provide opportunities and new development can play a role in linking to and enhancing existing character. In order to make the most of any such opportunities there needs to be more evidence and information relating to historic landscape character (and heritage more generally).</p>	<p>We understand this view but would still regard heritage considerations as a constraint on development. However, the need for any development to draw on and assist in the understanding of the historic and heritage context of the area needs to be included.</p>	<p>A section has been added to the Laverstock and Ford Design Guide 2021 covering the opportunity for promoting understanding and interpretation of the local historic/heritage setting.</p>
	<p>I believe that the Neighbourhood Planning Group did approach the Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service to obtain data from the county Historic Environment Record (HER) concerning both historic landscape character (HLC) and archaeology. This information should form an important evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan and includes information on both designated and undesignated landscapes and heritage assets. The raw data itself should be included in the appendices of the plan but important elements and themes could be linked directly into the main document and its policies/aims. This would demonstrate a more comprehensive consideration of present/historic landscape character and heritage and</p>	<p>The Historic Environment Record for the Parish was obtained and reviewed.</p>	<p>The HER has been added to the Supporting Evidence Section on the Documents page of the lfcnp.co.uk website and appropriate references to the HER have been included the NP/Appendices.</p>

	be beneficial to the Neighbourhood Plan.		
Section 8 Introductory text on Housing Provision p16	As previously advised, opting not to allocate land for housing in the neighbourhood plan means that the neighbourhood area will not qualify for the three-year housing land supply requirement ⁴ afforded by paragraph 14 of the NPPF. We would therefore advise that the steering group carry out an assessment of whether there are any suitable opportunities for the neighbourhood plan to allocate a small-scale site (or sites) within the parish for housing.	We fully understand this and have considered the possibility of an allocation. However, the strategic allocations in the parish have and, for some time, will continue to supply affordable housing volumes considerably in excess of those required to meet local needs The recent opening of a care home in Longhedge supplements the care for the elderly already provided by homes in Milford and Old Sarum	Considered and decided not to take forward. No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.
Section 8.2, pages 16 - 17	The assumptions listed in this section are noted. However, consultation on the Emerging Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan Review concluded in March 2021 and resulted in a significant number of responses. Officers are currently processing all the representations received and will be taking them into account when preparing the submission draft Local Plan. As such, changes to the current policy framework cannot be ruled out.	Noted, but we can only work on currently available information.	No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.
Section 8, general comments on the format and presentation of the policies	It is critical that policies are clearly distinguishable from the supporting text of the plan. The reader should be able to determine from a policy what is, or is not, expected of a development proposal, as required by NPPF paragraph 16 d).	Agreed.	Policies have been reviewed and split into clear policy statements and supporting text with appropriate formatting to distinguish them (as used in the published WC Core Strategy document).
	Where the Green Space Buffers are defined, it is helpful if a map can be provided which can then be referenced in the policy itself. This will avoid confusion over which areas of land within the parish are covered by the policy.	Agreed.	A map has been included.

	It should also be possible to understand how the policies relate to meeting the objectives of the plan which, in turn, support achieving the overarching vision. The supporting text can be used to explain these relationships.	Agreed.	Policies have been redrafted to include their relationship to the objectives.
Policy 1, Section 8.3.1	Point 1) The first sentence “Maintain the existing Green Space Buffer separating these settlements...” reads more like an objective than policy and, as such, should be moved outside of the policy into supporting text.	Agreed.	Policy has been redrafted to read as a policy rather than an objective.
	Point 1) The ‘Green Space Buffers’ should be defined in supporting text and/or on a map which can then be referred to in the policy.	Agreed.	Green Space Buffers (to be renamed “Green Buffers”) have been defined on a map to which reference has been made in revised policy wording.
	Point 2), as currently worded, doesn’t appear to materially add to the existing strategic policy framework (Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy) in relation to infill development at Small Villages.	Agreed.	The definition of infill has been moved to supporting text and the policy section was revised.
	Point 3) the first sentence of a) “the village should remain a discrete settlement’ reads more like an objective than policy. It is suggested that this be reworded along the lines of “The village of Ford shall be retained as a discrete settlement. Development proposals must ensure that Ford is...”, followed by the two bullet points. the Green Space Buffer should be defined in supporting text and/or a map.	Agreed.	Policy has been redrafted on the lines suggested, with Green Space Buffers defined on map.
	Point 3) The last sentence of the second bullet point is explanatory in nature and would also be better placed in supporting text. For criterion (b) the last part of the sentence starting “...and should be limited...” is covered by Core Policy 2 of the WCS and therefore can be moved into supporting text.	Agreed.	Policy has been redrafted on the lines suggested.

	<p>Point 4) – is explanatory in nature and reiterates content of the WCS and therefore can be moved into supporting text.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>This section has been moved to supporting text.</p>
	<p>Point 5) appears to largely reiterate the requirements of Core Policy 25 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, it refers to the management plan for the conservation area being in place etc – there is already a management plan of sorts, so this para may not be helpful, and it doesn't actually indicate who is responsible. It is therefore recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group work with Wiltshire Council to establish the appropriate balance between the role of strategic (Local Plan) policy and Neighbourhood Plan policy relating to Old Sarum Airfield.</p>	<p>There have been several draft Management Plan versions produced by an organisation commissioned by the proposed developer for part of this Area, with the last dated 2015. However, it is our understanding that none were endorsed by WC (the authority that has the responsibility for the document) or were submitted for consideration to a public meeting within the local area. Agreed with recommendation, but with the modification that it is for the PC rather than the NP Steering Group to work with WC. NP Group have contacted WC over joint working and await further developments.</p>	<p>Reference to joint working between PC and WC has been made in supporting text.</p>
	<p>General comments on Policy 1: WC Ecologist offered the following comments in relation to Policy 1: 'Policy 1 supports small scale infill development and the whole plan lies within the catchment of the River Avon SAC. Any new residential development within the catchment, even small-scale development, has potential to result in a likely significant effect on the River Avon SAC in combination with other plans and projects on account of additional phosphorus loading of the watercourse. Therefore, in line with the approach taken for other neighbourhood plans, the neighbourhood plan needs</p>	<p>HRA screening has been completed and an AA carried out by WC, who confirmed that Natural England were content with the results of the HRA screening and hence there was no requirement for an SEA.</p>	<p>No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.</p>

	to be taken forward to Appropriate Assessment (AA); this is on account of Policy 1. ‘		
Policy 2 Section 8.3.2	This policy relates to the protection and enhancement of landscape and biodiversity and also seeks to designate Local Green Spaces in line with paragraphs 99 – 101 of the NPPF. Appendix 11 sets out the justification for the Local Green Space Designations. In addition to the general comments on policies above, comments on the details of Policy 2 are as follows: Point 2) is open to interpretation and it is therefore recommended that the opening sentence is changed from “There should be...” to “There is...”	Agreed.	Policy has been reworded in the light of this comment and that of the WC Landscape section below.
	Point 3) - this criterion only relates to housing development. Is that the intention or should it apply to other proposed uses?	The intention is that it should apply to all development	Policy has been reworded to cover all development.
	Point 5) appears to be a separate aspirational matter rather than a policy seeking to manage development and therefore should be situated in the supporting text.	Agreed.	Section has not been included in policy.
	Point 6) would perhaps be better placed in its own separate policy titled “Designated Local Green Spaces”.	Agreed that it should be better placed in its own separate policy.	Separate policy has been created.
	Point 6) The second part of the first sentence starting “...as supported by responses to the residents’	Agreed.	Section has been moved to supporting text.

	questionnaire...” is explanatory and should be moved into supporting text.		
	Point 7) – this point appears to be supporting text outlining the aspirations of the parish council rather than a policy to direct development proposals.	Agreed.	Section has been moved to supporting text.
	<p>The Landscape section offers the following advice: Point 2) The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment concludes that due to the topography the undeveloped land within the parish is highly visible therefore mostly of high/medium-high landscape sensitivity. However, the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment provides advice for areas that are classified Medium/High on what development could be achieved and the appropriate level of mitigation to provide the best landscape fit. In some areas of High Sensitivity, the study has scoped in the possibility of appropriate scaled agricultural buildings that would not be at odds with the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Therefore because of study recommendations and advice it is difficult to adopt a presumption against development in High or Medium/High areas. This policy needs to be reworded e.g. development should only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposals comply with the recommendations of the Landscape Sensitivity Report... or similar.</p>	Agreed that this part of the policy should be reworded on lines suggested.	Policy has been reworded.
	Point 3) A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is for EIA developments which would be picked up by Development Management. For small scale development a Landscape and Visual Appraisal is the appropriate tool. Should it only be	Agreed that this part of the policy should be reworded on lines suggested.	Policy has been reworded.

	<p>applied to developments of more than 2 dwellings? For example, a single new agricultural building in a high sensitivity landscape has the potential to cause significant visual intrusion. Suggest rewording e.g. All development proposals, especially in High and Medium/High sensitivity landscape, should be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal proportionate to the scale of the development... or similar Or consider combining policy 2 & 3 because LVA is the tool that can demonstrate the proposal has complied with the recommendations of the sensitivity report.</p>		
	<p>Point 1) WC Landscape section also suggested removing the reference to 'wherever possible' as it weakens the policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Revision to policy has omitted "wherever possible".</p>
	<p>There is no provision for the protection of, or allowance for the mitigation of, sub-surface archaeology in any of the proposed policies. This is a serious omission considering the very high archaeological potential of the parish as a whole, particularly for later prehistoric and Roman settlement, funerary monuments, and field systems. We advise that the protection of heritage assets is made one of the key aims of Policy 2, alongside the ecological aims of that policy. In the first instance this policy should state that the preservation in situ of sub-surface archaeology should be the first consideration of any planning application and that any proposed development within the parish should be accompanied by a heritage statement produced under the standards and guidelines as set out by the Chartered</p>	<p>Agreed that the policy should be revised to cover the protection of sub-surface archaeology.</p>	<p>Policy has been revised along the lines suggested.</p>

	<p>Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). If preservation in situ is not deemed an appropriate response to a planning application, then the policy should require appropriate archaeological work to be carried out prior to the determination of an application in order to fully assess the likely impact of the proposed development upon the archaeological resource, and this to be followed, if required, by further work to mitigate any such impacts. The costs of any works are to be borne by the applicant under the 'polluter pays' principle.</p>		
	<p>WC Ecologist welcomes Policy 2. Suggest Point 4 a) of Policy 2 is amended to require that the ecological assessment includes quantitative evidence of biodiversity net gain using Natural England's Biodiversity Metric. Suggest that Point 4 b) of Policy 2 or the supporting text is amended to clarify what is meant by 'disruption', or that instead the policy stipulates that there should be no encroachment into the green corridors cited.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Policy has been reworded.</p>
<p>Policy 3, Section 8.3.3</p>	<p>The text in bold type is clearly aimed at managing development which is more in keeping with the style of a policy than for policies 1 and 2. But it is unclear which parts of the subsequent text are also to be considered policy and which are supporting text. For example, the first paragraph starting "Any development proposal should follow..." appears to form part of the policy but the first and second sentences of the next paragraph starting "The design of new housing development has the potential..." are explanatory in nature and almost certainly supporting text. The</p>	<p>Agreed that policy wording and supporting text should be revised on lines suggested.</p>	<p>Policy wording and supporting text have been revised.</p>

	<p>next sentence then introduces what seem to be policy requirements. This will need to be clarified.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the reference to compliance with the Design Guide should be included within the policy itself to ensure it is given the appropriate weight in decision making.</p>		
Policy 4, Section 8.3.4	<p>As highlighted in previous comments, the text in bold type at the start of policy 4 is written in the style of an objective rather than policy. The subsequent paragraphs appear to be community aspirations and could go into the supporting text. This will need to be clarified.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Sustainable Transport Team are generally happy with the content</p>	Agreed that policy wording and supporting text should be revised on lines suggested.	Policy wording and supporting text have been revised.
	<p>WC Transport Team have also provided plans of draft cycle network and key walking routes from the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan They have advised that "It would be helpful...to refer to these routes/maps/the draft LCWIP more specifically</p>	Agreed that the reference should be made to relevant walking and cycling routes shown in the draft LCWIP.	Reference to the relevant walking and cycling routes in WC's draft LCWIP has been included.
Policy 5, Section 8.3.5	The text in bold at the start of policy 5 is written in the style of an objective rather than policy.	Comment noted. Policy wording to be revised in light of comment.	Policy wording has been revised.
Policy 6, Section 8.3.6	<p>The text in bold at the start of policy 6 is written in the style of an objective rather than policy.</p> <p>Based on the outcomes of previous Neighbourhood Plan Examinations, it is considered likely that an Examiner will view this policy as a community aspiration and, on that basis, decide to delete it or move it into the supporting text.</p> <p>Recommended that Policy 6 is moved to supporting text, possibly within the implementation, monitoring and review section of the neighbourhood plan.</p>	Agreed that policy should be moved to supporting text or revised.	Policy wording has been revised.
Section 9, Implementation,	A relatively minor point but, in the interests of clarity, the	Agreed.	Wording has been amended.

Monitoring and Review	Neighbourhood Plan will form part of the development plan for Wiltshire rather than part of the planning regulations.		
10 - Glossary	If the policy 2 is changed as suggested, the following would be a useful inclusion: Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA): A tool used to identify and assess the effects of change resulting from development on both the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right, as well as on people's views and visual amenity	Agreed.	Suggested text has been inserted into Glossary.

1.2 Wiltshire Councillor A (submission 1)

Comments received (1):

Page 5 top. Cockey Down - This is only one (important) element of Laverstock Downs. The downs should be included in the statement

Response: Agreed - this seems sensible as both Laverstock and Ford Downs are identified in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment at Appendix 9.

Follow-up action: The draft NP has been amended.

Comments received (2):

6.1 Vision

we are a Mars bar parish - Work, rest and PLAY. We have the fantastic Laverstock & Ford Sports Club and more, accessible, open space than any other parish. We have the community farm and Boscombe Down Aviation Collection Museum within a normally active airfield. recreation abounds and yet not mentioned.

Response: Agreed – both of these should be referenced in the NP. The Sports Club grounds provide a substantial area of green space in Laverstock. The Museum on the other hand is housed in one of the listed Hangers at Old Sarum Airfield and is significant facility which complements the airfield and its activities.

Follow-up action: Draft NP has been amended.

Comments received (3)

6.2 Aims

there should be a resistance to future strategic allocations, or all other aims will be compromised. Areas at risk include Milford and the last fields of the parish at Old Sarum. Any development would severely compromise your land appraisal outcomes.

Response: A neighbourhood plan does not have the remit to prevent or restrict a Local Authority from making a strategic allocation within a formal settlement boundary (or adjacent to it). Instead, a

neighbourhood plan can ensure that a Local Authority is aware of the views of residents who live within the area defined for the plan. A neighbourhood plan is also a useful tool to advise a Local Authority on the impact of further development on land within this area as provided by the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment at Appendix 9.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (4):

Laverstock schools - statement vague. There should be a clear aim to restore the views to the downs, from the village, which have been compromised by previous school extensions. When Wyvern was rebuilt, there was some restoration, so it can be done!

Response: No restoration of the views is possible unless a further rebuild is carried out; there is no evidence provided to suggest that this may happen during the timeframe of the NP. The statement in the pre-submission draft is considered appropriate.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (5):

7.1.1 Excellent!

Response: Thank you.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (6):

7.1.3 Spot on! Salisbury stifled superstore offering for Longhedge and yet employment land allocation was supposed to enable local job provision!

Response: No comment required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (7):

7.2.1 Exactly. All strategic sites should now be resisted. Adversely impact wellbeing and not for local needs. We have met any obligations for decades!

Response: Strategic allocations are made to support all within the Settlement Boundary and are not specific to local needs. Response against feedback on Section 6.2 is also applicable.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (8):

Page 12 strategic sites. Lazy planning and WC need to concentrate on brownfield sites. Developers want easy build. the 275 dwelling proposal at Old Sarum is grotesque and ruins the green end of the parish to Monarch's way, which would be severely compromised, as per landscape assessment. With more home working, office buildings will be vacated in Salisbury.

Response: The NP and Appendix 7 address the proposal for development on the S80 site at Old Sarum. The final paragraph of Section 7.2.2 in the NP makes the case for preferring brownfield

development and/or undeveloped land originally designated for commercial use, as at Longhedge. No further comment required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (9):

8.2 Assumption 5. This change should be used to eliminate the Old Sarum allocation proposal, as views from Monarch's Way, over highly sensitive land, will be severely compromised, without any necessity.

Response: The relationship between a neighbourhood plan and strategic allocations is addressed above. Both the NP and Appendix 7 address the proposal for development on the S80 site at Old Sarum and we believe that the landscape impact of the proposed development has been underestimated in the Wiltshire Council Sustainability Assessment. No further comment required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (10):

8.3.1 1. remove 'Proper'.

Response: Agreed.

Follow-up action: The draft NP has been amended to delete 'proper.'

Comments received (11):

8.3.1.2 Add: Enhancement of downland to village views. (Based on subsequent email correspondence his comment was clarified to mean "add enhancement of views of downland from Laverstock village, especially from Church Road").

Response: We consider that the revised Policy 3 (the original Policy 2) is the appropriate way to achieve this aim without reference to specific views.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (12):

Page 18 Old Sarum Airfield - should include retention of the 3 elements which led to Conservation status. a. grass airstrip. b. Almost complete set of WW1 buildings. c. Perimeter largely intact. (That made it unique). Rather than major on development as 'acceptable if', the NP should seek to restore the Airfield with any development only enhancing the Conservation Area.

Response: Agreed that the first point is relevant but noting that a. should read 'the grass flying field' as the 'grass strip' is something which came about post WW2. The 2nd point is already covered in 8.3.1.5a

Follow-up action: The draft NP has been amended to reflect the 3 elements which led to the Conservation designation, noting that that b. should refer to WW1 **Technical** buildings (see Follow-up Action to feedback above on 6.1).

Comments received (13):

8.3.1.5 OS Airfield. See separate input re core policy 25. WC should review Core Policy 25 via Local Plan review

Response: See relevant response in 2nd submission by Wiltshire Councillor A.

Follow-up action: See 2nd submission by Wiltshire Councillor A for any Follow-up Action.

Comments received (14):

Page 21 Remove: preferably by the provision of an off road route. The on-road cycle lanes have reduced speed by 13mph!

Response: Disagreed. With many of the roads around the parish being narrow and winding, off road routes bypassing these would be a safer option for a cyclist. Furthermore, the on road cycle lanes on Church Road are often blocked by parked cars at the busiest times. Assuming the speed reduction quoted of 13mph is applicable to Church Road Laverstock, it is not clear whether the assessment of speed for on road cycle lanes was obtained when the lanes were first introduced and were a new phenomenon. The reduction quoted may no longer be applicable as no date for the assessment is provided.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.3 Wiltshire Councillor A (submission 2)

All comments relate to Core Policy 25 Old Sarum Airfield

Comments received (1):

WC should review Core Policy 25 via the Local Plan Review

The policy was drawn up following Conservation Area status grant. It was influenced by 2 residents of Stratford sub castle proactively contacting resident of Ford, Old Sarum and Stratford SC stating that the noise will get worse and that if they do not sign the petition to limit Old Sarum Airfield, it could be the next Heathrow! Despite all this and the issuing of a response proforma letter, to send to the then Salisbury District Council, only just over a hundred responses were received, mostly on the form or using the exact words supplied. There was also 'input' from Old Sarum Airfield which led SDC and subsequently WC, to conjure up CP25. I managed to get this amended to include Cllr and local community engagement and even got the southern site (Ford) removed from the Core strategy. This was subsequently re-inserted when WC failed to effectively, defend at Inspector hearings.

Response: This is background information relating to Core Policy 25. It is not appropriate to include this information in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (2):

There can be no agreement to limit flying or noise, which will survive a legal challenge. This was proven when SDC sought Counsel advice. The counsel cited White Waltham airfield, in a case raised by Teresa May MP. The High Court decision was that although agreement could be made, any agreement is unenforceable, as the Airfield has historic rights. this applies to Old Sarum too.

Response. The draft Neighbourhood Plan reflects the statement by Wiltshire Council in the relevant Core Policy. Current evidence to support the statement that 'there can be no agreement to limit flying or noise which will survive a legal challenge' is required before any changes to the draft Plan relevant to this point can be considered. Further investigation as to the current legal view is required.

Follow-up action: No change required to the draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices

Comments received (3):

The only task is to maintain and enhance the conservation area. This MUST focus on restoration of a WW1 Airfield and greater public access. The 3 key elements of Old Sarum, which made it unique, in the eyes of English Heritage (now Historic England), are :

1. Grass airstrip intact.
2. Almost a complete set of WW1 original Airfield buildings. - these are not being protected by WC and some are being compromised or deteriorating and some even destroyed.
3. Its perimeter almost intact.

It was the 3 combined which made it unique in WW1 history.

Response: The significance of these 3 elements is acknowledged in a response to a similar comment contained in Wiltshire Councillor A's first submission to the consultation.

Follow-up action: The draft NP has been amended to reflect the significance of the 3 elements.

Comments received (4):

Best way forward is for a Heritage group to take on the Airfield and apply for grants, by working with Historic England and WC. It should have a fully consulted management plan for the conservation area and seek to restore, where possible and introduce far greater public access to museum offerings, site tours and recreational flying.

Core 25 does not achieve this. It encourages development as the means of 'enhancement'.

Response: The view expressed above is noted. However, it would not be appropriate for a neighbourhood plan to recommend that a Heritage Group should 'take on' the airfield. Furthermore, Wiltshire Council's Core Policy for the Conservation Area already identifies the requirement for a management plan.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.4 Wiltshire Councillor B

Comments received:

I feel this plan has a balance between the significant development that has already taken place in the parish and how the parish further develops in the future as well as recognising the need for development and the current progression of the Salisbury local plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.5 Highways England

Comments received:

Having reviewed the submitted Plan we are satisfied that the Plan's proposed policies are unlikely to result in development which will adversely impact the Strategic Road network and we therefore have no comments to make. This does not however 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 prevailing policy at the time.

Response: No response required.

Follow up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.6 Wessex Water

Comments received:

Wessex Water is continually investing to maintain its existing infrastructure and to provide new infrastructure in response to new development and environmental improvement requirements. As a statutory undertaker, some works are permitted development, but certain works will require us to seek express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority. Infrastructure development and maintenance by utility companies by its nature needs to be functional and considerations such as security and health and safety must take precedence over appearance. While we seek to ensure design is as sensitive to its location as possible, there are often constraints on location (due to existing below ground infrastructure), materials (for example requirements to meet national security standards) and size/form (driven by operational requirements). We aim to minimise artificial lighting as far as is possible, but this may be required to allow operations staff to safely access infrastructure for routine and emergency maintenance. We would recommend that any proposed policies on design, views, artificial lighting, settlement boundaries/greengaps and countryside location are written with flexibility to ensure that they are not restrictive on infrastructure development. Policies should make clear the type of development to which they apply rather than using general terms such as 'all development'.

Response: It is accepted that infrastructure for basic services, such as sewage pumping stations and electricity sub-stations, have functional and legal requirements which must be satisfied as a first priority. However, we believe that the provider should make every effort to mitigate the visual and environmental impact of such structures within the constraints of the site, particularly when it is part of a new development, where a larger site footprint may be needed to achieve appropriate mitigation, such as by perimeter hedge planting.

Follow-up action: The Laverstock and Ford Design Guide 2021, referenced in Policy 3, has been amended as appropriate.

1.7 Natural England

Comments received:

Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft Laverstock & Ford Communities Neighbourhood Plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.8 SGN

Comments received:

Only comments at this time are in relation to the SHELAA Site Allocations.

NETWORK OVERVIEW

All sites should be in a location where the gas network is close by, so the initial physical connection to the system should not be a problem.

Gas demand for the Strategic Site Allocation was estimated based on the number of dwellings. This was then added and analysed on our Network Analysis Model. From the review I found that the Intermediate Pressure (IP) and Medium Pressure (MP) tiers of the network are relatively robust in this area and *at this time* the addition of the proposed sites did not pose a risk to the operation of the system or the capacity.

Please note:

- Reinforcement of the existing Low Pressure (LP) network may be necessary to support development on this scale, dependant on the site demand and the final point of connection to SGN's network. This will usually only be known when a connections enquiry/request is made.
- SGN are unable to book capacity and the above assessment does not guarantee the availability of future capacity which is offered on a 'first come, first served basis'.
- The UK Governments plan to stop all domestic connections to the gas network post 2025 was not taken into consideration at this time, however it is worth being aware of this possible new regulation.

STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS

Where required, SGN will look to manage the provision of any off-site infrastructure improvements, in line with the overall development growth and / or timescales provided. The full extent of these works will be dependent on the nature and location of the requested load(s), potentially requiring LP reinforcement in addition to that required for the IPMP networks and will only become clear once a developer's request has been received. Reinforcement solutions are likely to involve the provision of a new pipeline in parallel to SGN's existing mains system but may also include the installation of above ground apparatus involving land purchase.

As this is a high-level assessment and response, the information provided is indicative only and should be use as a guide to assist you on your assessment. While information obtained through consultation and / or engagement on Local Development Plans is important to our analysis, it only acts to identify potential development areas. Our principle statutory obligations relevant to the development of our gas network arise from the Gas Act 1986 (as amended), an extract of which is given below:-

Section 9 (1) and (2) which provides that:

9. General powers and duties

- (1) It shall be the duty of a gas transporter as respects each authorised area of his:-
- (a) to develop and maintain an efficient and economical pipe-line system for the conveyance of gas; and
 - (b) subject to paragraph (a) above, to comply, so far as it is economical to do so, with any reasonable request for him -
 - (i.) to connect to that system, and convey gas by means of that system to, any premises; or
 - (ii.) to connect to that system a pipe-line system operated by an authorised transporter.

(1A) It shall also be the duty of a gas transporter to facilitate competition in the supply of gas.

- (2) It shall also be the duty of a gas transporter to avoid any undue preference or undue discrimination -
- (a) in the connection of premises or a pipe-line system operated by an authorised transporter to any pipe-line system operated by him; and in the terms of which he undertakes the conveyance of gas by means of such a system.

SGN would not, therefore, develop firm extension or reinforcement proposals until we are in receipt of confirmed developer requests.

As SGN is the owner and operator of significant gas infrastructure within the area and due to the nature of our licence holder obligations;

- Should alterations to existing assets be required to allow development to proceed, such alterations will require to be funded by a developer.
- Should major alterations or diversions to such infrastructure be required to allow development to proceed, this could have a significant time constraint on development and, as such, any diversion requirements should be established early in the detailed planning process.

Response: None required as no development is proposed.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.9 Historic England

Comments received:

There are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment other than to positively note the policy provisions for protecting and enhancing the distinctive historic character of the area and maintaining the discrete qualities of the settlements in question.

Our congratulations to your communities on the progress to date, and our best wishes for the making of your Plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.10 National Grid

Comments received:

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.

National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.11 Environment Agency

Comments received:

No comments to make.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

1.12 Salisbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group/SCC

Comments received (1):

There is broad support for Policy 1 which seeks to maintain the local distinctiveness of the settlements which make up the parish and their landscape setting. It is important to protect the sensitive landscape setting for their communities as well as for Salisbury parish. The developer requirement of a Landscape Visual Impact Analysis (LVIA) for development in excess of two properties is also supported. However, the policy would benefit from being more clearly set out. It would for instance be helpful to have a map showing clearly show the extent of the Green Space Buffer referred to in the policy. It would also be helpful to have clear settlement boundaries within which the infill policy applies. The policy text regarding the Conservation Area requires “An approved Management Plan for the Conservation Area should be in place before consideration is given to any future development”. This does not state how the masterplan should be prepared nor who is responsible. It is conceivable that the preparation of such a masterplan would take a considerable amount of time and it is not reasonable to prevent all future development in the interim period.

Response: The intention of the Green Space Buffers mentioned is to maintain the separate identity of the locations mentioned relative to the border of the suburbs of Salisbury which are contiguous with the city itself. While it is inappropriate to exclude all development, it is intended to limit it to extensions to existing properties or single plot new build properties such that the green space appearance remains uncompromised. Furthermore, in the case of a ‘small village’ as defined in the Wiltshire Core Strategy (ie Ford and Laverstock) a Buffer must be sufficiently large to ensure that any development does not constitute lengthening of the village. For these reasons, we plan to include an indicative, rather than precisely defined, map of the Green Space Buffers (to be renamed as “Green Buffers”).

The Wiltshire Core Strategy removes settlement boundaries from some villages including Ford and Laverstock; therefore, it would be inappropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to attempt to define a settlement boundary for these 2 villages.

There appears to be some confusion when referring to the Old Sarum Conservation Area ‘an approved Management Plan for the Conservation Area’ and ‘the masterplan’. These have different functions. A masterplan would be associated with a planning application and would be produced by a developer and should identify in detail any proposed development. On the other hand, a Management Plan would be expected to contain proposals for the preservation of and enhancement of the Conservation Area and is the responsibility of a Local Planning Authority in this case Wiltshire Council (Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies). A full appraisal was made of the airfield which led to the Conservation Area designation in 2008 and further information became available as a result of the 2019 planning appeal associated with a planning application for development on the airfield. Therefore, it should be possible for Wiltshire Council to ensure that a Management Plan is in place in a reasonable timeframe.

Follow-up action: Explanatory text and an indicative map have been inserted into Policy 1 to support the requirement for Green Space Buffers. Section 5 of Policy 1 has been amended to identify that Wiltshire Council is responsible for ensuring that ‘an approved Management Plan is in place before consideration is given to any future development’ Note: in the revised Neighbourhood Plan this part of original Policy 1 has been split out as a separate Policy 2.

Comments received (2):

There is support for Policy 2 on GBI which recognises not only the importance of the local landscape character, its sensitivity and habitat value but the principle of protecting existing green and blue corridors and strengthening the multifunctional GBI network. The proposals for designating local green spaces of community value shown on Figure 4 include Castle Hill Country Park (Site 1) and the Devenish Bradshaw Trust Watermeadows site (Site 6) which adjoins the River Bourne Community Farm. Both

sites and including the farm, are considered significant assets for the City and wider area as well as Laverstock and Ford parish.

Response: Figure 4 in the draft Plan does not include the Devenish Bradshaw Trust Watermeadows site. It was excluded as the Trust advised that it was adequately protected from commercial development by an ownership clause and by charitable objectives in its constitution. The Trust requested therefore that it not be designated as Local Green Space. Reference is made currently to the site in the Footnote to Appendix 10 where it is identified as Site 6 in Fig 1. It is made clear in this Footnote that the Local Green Space designation is not sought for this site.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (3):

In addition to improvements to the cycle lanes on Church Lane it might be appropriate to mention other key cycle routes within the Parish, and the aspiration to improve both the routes themselves and links to them, e.g.:

- Golden Way(see <http://www.connectingwiltshire.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/830-Salisbury-Council-Cycling-DL-for-print.pdf>). Would benefit from safety improvements e.g. on Milford Mill Road
- Bishopdown Laverstock link, useful link particularly to serve Laverstock schools, would benefit from additional links to integrate to the wider cycle network (e.g. to Cow Lane)
- Green Lane – as mentioned in Appendix 5 this is poorly surfaced in places and has dangerous crossings e.g. across Ford Road

Response: Agreed that Policy 4 should be amended to include an aspiration for improvements to these routes in the supporting text.

Follow-up action: Policy 4 has been amended and the Parish Council will work towards establishing a working group with SCC/SCCNPSG to develop the aspirations into implementable proposals. Note that original Policy 4 is Policy 6 in the revised Neighbourhood Plan.

Comments received (4):

There may also be potential to improve pedestrian/cycle links between Old Sarum housing estate and Salisbury central area via Castle Hill CountryPark and between Ford and Old Sarum Castle. The possibility of negotiating strips of land in public ownership (Wiltshire County Farm) alongside of the track at the west end of Old Sarum Airfield and along the south side of the Ford Road would need to be investigated but Laverstock and Ford Parish Council already own the Castle Hill Country Park (Local Green Space 1).

Response: This is would make a useful addition to the pedestrian/cycle links within the parish. However, it is not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan to pursue an individual link which involves land ownership aspects. The Parish Council is both the qualifying body for the Plan as well as owner of part of the land referred to above and therefore it is something the Parish Council should consider pursuing with Wiltshire Council and SCC.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (5):

Overall, it would be helpful if these routes were indicated on an OS based map so that future development and other sources of funding can make meaningful improvements to routes.

Response: It is assumed that this sentence refers to the routes identified in the 2 previous paragraphs. Before identifying these routes on an OS based map within the NP as future aspirations, it would be

useful if both SCC and Laverstock and Ford Parish Council were discuss the concept through involvement in a suitable working group(s). (See final response below.)

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (6):

Given the reference to reducing the use of cars for journeys to work it might be appropriate to make more reference to the employment areas either within the Parish or served by cycle routes through it. Porton is a growth area for employment, and Laverstock and Ford would be an attractive place to live for workers there. It is within easy cycling distance, particularly by e-bike, but the lack of a safe cycling route is a deterrent.

Response: Agreed.

Follow-up action: Policy 4 has been amended as appropriate. Note that original policy 4 is Policy 6 in the revised Neighbourhood Plan.

Comments received (7):

It would be worth including a reference to cyclists in Policy 5 as well as pedestrians ('aimed at increasing pedestrian and cyclist safety...').

Response: Agreed.

Follow-up action: Policy 5 has been amended. Note that original policy 5 is Policy 7 in the revised Neighbourhood Plan.

Comments received (8):

Policy 6 covers improvements to bus services, and it might be worth expanding Appendix 5 Transport Issues on this point. Section 5 of Appendix 5 refers to the Salisbury Transport Strategy and the Public Transport schemes most relevant to Laverstock and Ford communities could be added to the bulleted list. Specifically PT03 covers bus priority measures on Park and Ride routes including Castle Road (to Beehive) and London Road. Also PT05 supports 'High Frequency buses serving all new development sites – at least 4 buses per hour'.

Response: The main focus of Appendix 5 is on the impact of recent development on traffic within the Parish and the need for investment in appropriate measures. However, we will make reference to the proposed improvements to bus services in the Salisbury Transport Strategy and to the need for appropriate improvements to the bus services, cycle and pedestrian routes to accompany future housing development.

Follow-up action:-Appendix 5 has been reworded.

Comments received (9):

It might also be worth expanding the 'Car availability' tables at the end of the Appendix to make reference to the 11.6% of households in the Parish who do not have access to a car (Census data 2011, KS404EW). This serves to underline the importance of non-car transport modes for those who do not have access to a car. Improvements to public transport, and to walking and cycling links which encourage active travel, are beneficial to everyone but particularly those without access to a car and non-drivers including school-age children.

Response: Agree.

Follow-up action: Appendix 5 has been amended to include information on households without access to a car or van. Please note that, according to the 2011 Census, **10.8%** of households in the Parish of

Laverstock and Ford as currently constituted (ie including Bishopdown Farm which became part of the Parish in 2016) did not have a car or van available.

Comments received (10):

The SNDP steering group, and in particular, the Connectivity Focus Group and GBI Topic Group, would welcome the opportunity to discuss potential for improvements to specific walking and cycling routes and how these can be integrated with thinking more broadly about local GBI.

Response: As indicated above, the Parish Council may wish to discuss the potential improvements with these 2 groups. No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Follow-up action: The Parish Council has been appraised of this suggestion.

2 Local Organisations

2.1 Plymouth Brethren

Comments received:

None

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

2.2 Boscombe Down Aviation Collection

Comments received:

Support the thoughts regarding the Portway (e.g. 8.3.5 policy 5) and Old Sarum Airfield as outlined in the Laverstock and Ford draft neighbourhood plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

3 Landowners and Agents

3.1 Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust

Comments received (1):

Request that the following erroneous line on page 5 in the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan is corrected:

"Laverstock Water Meadows (owned by the Devenish Bradshaw Charity Trust and leased to the Farm),"

We suggest the following would be an accurate statement:

"Laverstock Water Meadows (a tract of which is owned and managed in-hand by Devenish Bradshaw Charitable Trust with other accessible areas owned and managed by private and other community organisations)"

Response: The suggested correction to the text is accepted.

Follow-up action: NP text has been revised to incorporate the correction.

Comments received (2):

Request that the following incorrect line in the Annex for Local Greenspace Designations is removed. And that all references to our land are removed from this Annex.

""The area marked 6 is the location of the River Bourne Community Farm and a note about this area is added at the end.""

Response: Changes requested accepted.

Follow-up action: Draft NP has been revised to incorporate requested changes.

Comments received (3):

We recommend that a comprehensive Green Infrastructure audit is commissioned either as a supporting document for the Plan or by the Parish Council as part of the Parish Plan Review.

Response: Comment noted - for consideration by Parish Council.

Follow up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices

3.2 Blue Fox/ Bloor Homes

Key points to address:

1) Status of Site S80 (Site 1) in recent Wiltshire Council Site Assessment exercises

Comments received:

It is not accurate to say that S80 was 'rejected' in the previous WHSAP assessment process; it was not pursued as there were other more sustainable sites.

Response: This inaccuracy is recognised and needs to be corrected.

Follow up action: Appropriate sections of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices have been amended.

2) Comparability of latest and previous Strategic Site Assessments

Comments received:

It is not possible or appropriate to compare the conclusions of the previous SA and that presented through the Wiltshire Council Local plan Review

Response: Disagreed: it is both possible and appropriate to do so.

- it is possible as eleven out of twelve objectives were common to both assessments
- It is appropriate as it sheds more light on the reasons for the conclusions reached and the conditions which any development would need to meet.

A detailed analysis of the two assessments shows that for Objectives 2, 7 and 8, the less adverse ratings in the LPR assessment are largely driven by a much greater emphasis on the contribution that mitigation measures ***could*** make to reduce the adverse impacts of development. What is particularly concerning is that reducing these assessments from “moderate adverse” to “minor adverse” risk sending signals to developers that any required mitigation measures would be modest. Furthermore, it is likely that the wording of these measures will be subject to differing interpretations. To illustrate this point, the mitigation measures mentioned in the LPR assessment includes creating ‘a strong landscape buffer that incorporates the Monarch’s Way and creates a softer settlement edge on the approach to Old Sarum from the northeast’. However, on the Concept Plan for Site 1, the buffer shown between the housing and Monarch’s Way is very narrow and is in sharp contrast with the much more effective and extensive buffer provided by the Country Park which forms part of the Longhedge Village development to the west of S80.

Follow up action: No change required to the Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

3) Local housing need

Comments received:

The figures on housing need in Appendix 6 are only a snap shot in time and are focused on the NP area only and they do not identify future housing need over the plan period to 2036. There is no explanation or assessment as to how the long term affordability issues will be addressed over the period to 2036.

The NP housing need evidence should not be applied as a means of constraining strategic housing delivery which will be determined and implemented through the Local Plan process.

Response: Analysis of data for both October 2018 and March 2021 relating to the various housing registers which Wiltshire Council maintain (or have access to) indicates a low and relatively stable level of local housing need, reflecting the socio-economic composition of the parish.

Affordability of local housing is being addressed by the extensive and continuing provision of affordable homes in the parish. Between 2011 and 2019, over 600 affordable homes were completed, taking the total number to c970, rising by a further 100 to c1,070 on completion of the Longhedge development.

Affordable homes make up almost a quarter of the local housing stock, a much higher proportion than for England or Wiltshire or for comparable settlements with low levels of deprivation. Furthermore, to re-iterate a point made in the draft Neighbourhood Plan the S106 agreements for the recent development at Riverdown Park and the ongoing development at Longhedge Village give Wiltshire Council the right to allocate 75% of vacated social rented housing on both sites to people on the local housing register (see attached appendix for the relevant extracts from the S106 agreements)

The primacy of the Wiltshire Council Local Plan over the Neighbourhood Plan is fully recognised, including the priority given to allocating sites to meet the strategic needs of the Salisbury Housing Market Area. In this context, evidence on local housing need **is not being used** to constrain

strategic housing delivery: **it is being used** solely (and legitimately) to demonstrate that there is no requirement for development in the parish to meet **local** housing need for the foreseeable future.

In line with Wiltshire Council's current plan review process, it is the intention to re-assess local housing need as part of a review of our Neighbourhood Plan after five years.

Follow up action: No change required to the Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4) Landscape sensitivity assessment

Comments received:

This assessment does not consider:

- site specific mitigation or other strategies that can ensure future development responds positively and sensitively to its landscape setting
- the future development requirements of this Housing Market Area and the extent to which specific proposals can be appropriately accommodated within the context of their landscape constraints.

Response: The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment for the parish sets out a range of measures which could reduce the adverse impact of future housing developments on their landscape setting, including measures relating to Site S80. The consultant's conclusion from the assessment of Site S80 was that development was not recommended due to its proximity to Monarch's Way and adjacent open space and country park. Even with mitigation measures in place, her professional judgement was to 'avoid large developments which are immediately noticeable in the landscape.....avoid development adjacent to long distance footpath'

Follow up action: no change required to the Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Appendix: Extracts from Section 106 agreements on affordable housing nominations for Riverdown Park and Longhedge Village developments

1 Extract from the S106 agreement between Wiltshire Council and Swaythling Housing Society relating to the housing development at Riverdown Park, 8 July 2014

"3.1 From the date that each Dwelling is available for occupation, the Council shall be entitled to the Nomination Rights to nominate an occupier of the Dwelling at first instance in accordance with the Allocations Policy

3.4 After the letting of all the dwellings pursuant to clause 3.1 hereof the Council shall be entitled to the Nomination Rights in respect of the Rented Units to nominate 75% of the occupiers of those dwellings as fall vacant and for the purpose of allocating the said 75% the Council shall be entitled to nominate the first vacancy falling due"

Source: <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/planning-application/a0i3z000014dsTHAAY/s20091943?tabset-8903c=2>

2 Extract from the S106 Deed of Variation between Wiltshire Council and Bovis Homes Ltd and Linden Wates Salisbury LLP and Swaythling Housing Society (the Transferee) relating to the housing development at Longhedge Village, 11 November 2019

“The Council and the Transferee shall have the following nomination rights in respect of the Affordable Housing Units:

	Nominations
The initial allocation of each dwelling	The Council 100%
Thereafter	The Council 75%
	The Transferee 25%”

Source: <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/planning-application/a0i3z000014dukAAA/1300673out?tabset-8903c=2>

3.3 Savills/Hallam

Response to Savills / Hallam submission on R14 Consultation Version of the NP

There are 4 specific aspects of the submission which could impact on the Neighbourhood Plan and are addressed here. Two of these are identified under **Highways / Infrastructure improvements** section, one under **Polices** and one within **Conclusions**.

1 Highways / Infrastructure improvements

Comments received (1.1):

The provision of market and policy compliant affordable housing to meet local needs would be one of the benefits of the allocation of land at Milford Farm for housing development.

Response: The Neighbourhood Plan includes a Local Housing Needs Assessment which clearly shows that the current needs of the parish for affordable housing are more than met by current building at Longhedge and that any future need through to 2036 would be covered by a proposed strategic housing allocation by Wiltshire Council within the parish as part of their emerging Local Plan. Furthermore, the S106 agreements for the recent development at Riverdown Park and the ongoing development at Longhedge Village give Wiltshire Council the right to initially allocate affordable rented housing on both sites to local people on Wiltshire Council’s Housing Register and then reallocate 75% of any such vacated housing thereafter. See Appendix 1 below for detailed references to the agreements.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (1.2):

Significant vehicular and pedestrian connectivity improvements along Milford Mill Road would be one of the benefits of the allocation of land at Milford Farm for housing development.

Response: The widening of Milford Mill Road and adding a footpath seems unlikely to reduce vehicular movements for a number of reasons:

- Even with traffic calming the easier passage of vehicles along the road will encourage rat running to and from the Southampton Road, trying to avoid the queues on the Southampton Road.
- The proposed footpath alongside Milford Mill Road will not increase the numbers choosing to walk from Laverstock to the retail centre unless the bridge where it passes under the railway is widened to accommodate a footpath (See photograph in Appendix 2), which does not seem to be proposed. If the foot/cycle access to the retail park is proposed to be by the existing footpath alongside Milford House Care Home (LAF027/SALS103), Wiltshire Council found this to be unsuitable in their

assessment of SHELAA site 3554b which is on the opposite side of Milford Mill Road (WC Local Plan Interim Sustainability Appraisal Annex 2 p96): “Nearby employment areas are only accessible by an unattractive and potentially insecure byway passing under the railway to the west of Milford Care Home; routes through the Milford Mill Road railway tunnel are not considered appropriate given the lack of footway and lack of opportunity to make such provision due to the narrow structure.” The overall assessment for site 3554b against SA objective 11 – “Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices” – was “major (significant) adverse effect” and was the reason for this site not being taken further in the site assessment process. We believe the same assessment would be made for this site, S72a.

- Residents of the proposed development would be deterred from walking into the centre of Salisbury as there would not be a continuous footpath from the development.
- Additional car journeys are very likely to be generated by parents taking children to the local primary and secondary schools which lie on the opposite side of Laverstock.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

2 Policies

Comments received:

Hallam Land disagree with the approach taken in at paragraph 8.3.1, Policy 1, Part 2) (Laverstock) of the draft NP where it is stated that:

‘Development to be limited to infill only (maximum of 2 dwellings. For the purposes of this policy the term ‘infill’ is taken to mean the filling of a small gap within the village in an otherwise built-up frontage, usually consisting of frontage plots only and surrounded on at least two sides by developed sites and normally capable or large enough for not more than two dwellings’

If future housing need is to be met a policy which does not permit or allocate development is not sustainable, unnecessarily restrictive, and non-compliant with Wiltshire’s Core Strategy. As such, it is the opinion of Hallam Land that the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the basic conditions for a NP to be made in that it fails to:

a) have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order,

(i.e. the NP has not had regard to the national housing shortage. NP policy is unduly restrictive and does not provide a degree of flexibility to accommodate housing need to 2036.)

Response: The Policy quoted from the Neighbourhood Plan for Laverstock is fully in line with the current Wiltshire Council Core Strategy and the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to argue in principle against any properly assessed strategic allocation by Wiltshire Council which may be needed to meet the requirements of the Salisbury HMA. The argument put forward in the above paragraph therefore revolves around the usual legal loophole which developers seek to exploit if the housing land supply for the whole of Wiltshire falls below 5 years. If we consider the Salisbury HMA, housing supply has been at a consistently high level, meeting or exceeding that planned, for several years, and continues to be delivered at various local sites, including Longhedge in the parish, while the emerging Local Plan addresses the continuing supply through to 2036. We therefore believe that the above argument is incorrect and that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions to be made.

Follow-up action: No change required to NP / Appendices.

3 Conclusions

Comments received:

Hallam Land is firmly of the view that the site offers a sustainable solution to market and affordable housing needs for the parish and that it could be allocated through the NP.

Response: For the reasons given in the above responses we believe that the site proposal as presented is not sustainable and that there will be no local requirement for additional affordable housing in the parish in the timescale of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Appendix 1 S106 Extracts relating to Nomination Rights for Affordable Housing Allocation

1 Extract from the S106 agreement between Wiltshire Council and Swaythling Housing Society relating to the housing development at Riverdown Park, 8 July 2014

“3.1 From the date that each Dwelling is available for occupation, the Council shall be entitled to the Nomination Rights to nominate an occupier of the Dwelling at first instance in accordance with the Allocations Policy

3.4 After the letting of all the dwellings pursuant to clause 3.1 hereof the Council shall be entitled to the Nomination Rights in respect of the Rented Units to nominate 75% of the occupiers of those dwellings as fall vacant and for the purpose of allocating the said 75% the Council shall be entitled to nominate the first vacancy falling due”

Source: <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/planning-application/a0i3z000014dsTHAAY/s20091943?tabset-8903c=2>

2 Extract from the S106 Deed of Variation between Wiltshire Council and Bovis Homes Ltd and Linden Wates Salisbury LLP and Swaythling Housing Society (the Transferee) relating to the housing development at Longhedge Village, 11 November 2019

“The Council and the Transferee shall have the following nomination rights in respect of the Affordable Housing Units:

	Nominations
The initial allocation of each dwelling	The Council 100%
Thereafter	The Council 75%
	The Transferee 25%”

Source: <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/planning-application/a0i3z000014dukAAA/1300673out?tabset-8903c=2>

Appendix 2 Photograph of the Railway Bridge over Milford Mill Road



3.4 Ministry of Defence

Comments received:

The MOD would wish to be consulted on any proposed development within the Laverstock and Ford Neighbourhood Plan which consists of structures or buildings exceeding 45.2m Above Ground Level (AGL) or any development which includes schemes that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation.

Response: None required, as no development is being proposed.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4 Residents

4.1 Hampton Park Resident

Comments received:

Please can the green area, used by local children for play, on Hartley Way be included as a local green area?

Response: No evidence from eg 2019 Residents' Survey to support this proposal. Respondent was invited to provide evidence, but none as yet received.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.2 Laverstock Resident A

Comments received (1):

Is it appropriate for the Laverstock and Ford Plan to contain a policy to resist any further secondary school expansion?

Response: NP has no power to override Wiltshire Council policies including those relating to education provision

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (2):

Concerned about is housing expansion in other parts of Salisbury with no joined up thinking regarding secondary school provision. This has the potential to increase the level of poor air quality in our district and it's long overdue for the children of Salisbury to be better served with schools local to their residential area.

Response: The location of education provision for the Salisbury area is outside the scope of our NP. However, any proposed development leading to the expansion of the Laverstock schools would be expected to undertake an assessment of the implications for air quality and contain appropriate proposed mitigation measures.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.3 Laverstock Resident B

Comments received:

I want to congratulate everyone who has contributed to this amazing document.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.4 Laverstock Resident C

Comments received (1):

The Aims and Objectives in 6.2 in most elements aspire to "enhance" and "improve". Landscape, including public open space, refers to "preserve and protect". My view is that this should also include enhance or improve, as this accords with later aspirations in the Plan of enhancing river corridors, wildlife and biodiversity.

Response: Agree that the use of "improve" or "enhance" in section 6.2 would be more consistent with the general thrust of the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives and policies. Change the wording of the first bullet point in section 6.2 (Aims and Objectives) as follows:

Protect and where possible enhance the existing open spaces and landscape used and valued by residents and visitors.

Follow-up action: NP has been amended.

Comments received (2):

There is a real lack of public open space in Laverstock village for children. We are lucky to have the sports club and River Bourne community farm, but otherwise there is very little quality public open space provision or variety for children. This is especially critical with the schools in the village which might enable children to stay longer, or arrive earlier, for school and help balance the traffic of school commuters.....As someone with small children who has moved into the village in the last 2 years, I am really surprised with the lack of equipped (and the quality thereof) and unequipped spaces for all ages. For a village with a strong community, connection with schools and children and connection with the outdoors, this feels like a major area for improvement and should feature in the NDP.

Response: Agree that there is relatively little designated public play space for children within Laverstock, but there is a large amount of access land on Laverstock/Cockey Downs with numerous public and permissive footpaths for general recreation. However the 2019 Residents' Survey did not indicate any general dissatisfaction with the provision of play areas or sports facilities among households with children living in Laverstock. Of those expressing an opinion, four out of five respondents rated playparks as good or adequate and two out of three rated sports facilities as good or adequate. The quality of equipment is a matter for the Parish Council who regularly inspect the play areas.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

Comments received (3):

I also note that the play area and open space for Laverstock doesn't appear in Figure 4 (designated local green spaces) and I was unclear why.

Response: This comment relates to the open space and play area adjoining Whitebridge Spinney, which is owned by the Parish Council. Agree that it would be appropriate to give additional protection to Whitebridge Spinney (including the adjoining public open space and play area) by including it as a Local Green Space within the Neighbourhood Plan. This designation is supported by the following evidence:

- The boardwalk through the Spinney and the adjoining area are extensively used by local residents.
- The 2019 Residents' Survey confirmed that Whitebridge Spinney was valued by the overwhelming majority of Laverstock residents.

Follow-up action: Policy 2 in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (and Appendix 10) have been amended to include Whitebridge Spinney as a Local Green Space.

4.5 Laverstock Resident D

Comments received:

I am in favour of the infill of 1/2 houses/bungalows which is a very good idea.

I worry that landowners/developers will try to find a loophole in any development if they want particular land bad enough.

I would have thought Laverstock in particular has enough houses now

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.6 Laverstock Resident E

Comments received:

I support the draft report. I believe it reflects the needs of our community and I am glad to see it recognises the need to respond to the climate and biodiversity crises

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.7 Laverstock Resident F

Comments received:

The position of the politicians on the proposed housing development in Church Road is pathetic. We need more housing. It should be allowed. Instead of spending tax payers money on parks, playgrounds, raised walk ways and other unnecessary stuff, use the taxes to repair roads. The potholes and dangerous ruts in the parish roads are unbelievable. The main road by white bridge as an example. Not repaired in years and it just gets worse with nothing done about it. All we hear about are these ridiculous not in my backyard objections and expensive fanciful plans. I don't want the unbelievably high council taxes spent on stupid projects. Sort out the flooding and condition of the road through to Petersfinger.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.8 Bishopdown Farm Resident

Comments received:

Pleased to see continued focus on the condition of the green spaces within the parish. However it is not clear to me that current plans such as the country park really grasp what biodiversity and latest government directives on habitat restoration means...I would encourage the council to think in terms of

natural or wild spaces rather than green. There's nothing natural about acres of mowed grass or countryside devoid of wild animals and we should not be teaching our children that it is.

Response: Comments noted.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.9 Riverdown Park Resident A

Comments received:

The plan was clearly written and the site easy to navigate. I support the plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.10 Riverdown Park Resident B

Comments received:

I fully support your approach to the plan.

Response: None required.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.

4.11 Longhedge Resident

Comments received:

- No mention of 3G football pitch - welcome addition for revenue and facilities to Longhedge
- Lack of mention around pub or communal facilities
- Road network around Longhedge becoming dangerous to car and local community
- Landscaping across the estate not maintained or upkept by builders

All the above concern issues relating to the implementation of the ongoing new development at Longhedge:

Response: Implementation issues relating to existing development are not within the scope of the NP.

Follow-up action: No change required to draft Neighbourhood Plan and appendices.