NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Page 5, para. 5	It is noted that there is no mention within the draft CWNP that the Wiltshire Core Strategy is being reviewed. NP Steering Group Observation: we should also include the Allington Conservation Area (2002).	The validity of this observation is acknowledged. Also, we have noted that the Allington Conservation Area Statement (2002) should be included in this section, and is presently absent. Therefore we will also include this.	Page 5, para 5 will include: "*The Allington Conservation Area Statement (2002), and the Wiltshire Local Plan (emerging)".*
Page 6. para.5	The reference to Core Policy 34 in the 'Introduction' section (para.6 Preparation of the Plan), whilst relevant, is somewhat confusing for the reader. It should be made clear that this policy relates to proposals for employment land only.	This reference to Core Policy 34 is in para.5, titled 'The need for a Neighbourhood Plan', <u>not</u> para. 6 . However, it is a valid observation.	Page 6, para 5 to include: " Here, rural development has been reviewed using Core Policy 10 as a guide while ever mindful that Core Policy 34 *covering Additional Employment Land* can be invoked . . ."
General and Page 14, Para.21	" . . it is not particularly obvious what the plan is seeking to achieve or deliver, within its plan period, over and above existing policy requirements . .. the draft neighbourhood plan in its current form lacks focus and therefore local value."	This criticism is not accepted. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) sets out clearly the history and current character of the existing settlements of Allington, Sheldon and Lanhill, and thus the historical legacy (which is notable) and the area's present usage which the NP seeks to maintain. The principles of allowing farming, the area's principal economic activity, to remain the central economic activity, whilst allowing managed growth of its business parks for rural employment, the continued	As the character of the economic and amenity activities in the NP area are to be maintained in their present form, there is no need for additional text regarding any modified 'development'. In order to clarify that housing development is strictly limited to the needs of present economic

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		use of its sporting and amenity facilities, along with housing development which meets the needs of the current population, are all very clearly stated in the Vision statement and subsequently in Objectives and Policies linked to this.	activities and the present population the NP text will be clarified in the Vision (page 14, para 21, section b.) to add an additional sentence to read: "*There is no formal requirement to deliver any further housing development within the parish of Chippenham Without and this plan does not propose the allocation of any specific sites."*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission, page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to specify what new development should like?"	As explained above, existing economic and amenity activity will be sustained and developed in its present character, so there is no 'new' development. In respect of housing, there is no formal requirement for 'new' development and so no sites have been allocated. Such development as does occur will be linked to existing and sustainable modification of rural economic activity and be consistent with the historic and visual appearance of the present settlements.	No clarification is required beyond the foregoing clarification to the Vision (page 14, para 21, section b.)
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to encourage any new types of accommodation (e.g. visitor accommodation, supported	Earlier stages of public consultation carried out by the NP Steering Group did not identify any clear need for new types of accommodation and the Housing Needs Survey, whilst recommending that the NP should take account of future anticipated need, identified only one	No fundamentally new clarification is required. However para 27, p.15 of the NP will be modified to read "Housing: Sustainability for the future is a

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
submission, page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:	housing for older residents)?"	person being in need of affordable housing and one household with a local connection in need of open market housing in the next 5 years (ref. HNS paras. 8.3 and 9.1). The NP Objectives and Policies clearly support the natural, limited development of existing properties to meet the requirements of existing residential and economic housing need and the Parish Council is currently implementing this policy allowing, for example, annex development for elderly family members at Allington Bar Farm and at the Gables at Sheldon Corner, and also visitor accommodation at Lanhill Farm. Overall Housing Policy is clearly stated in para. 27, page 15 of the NP development for elderly family members at Allington Bar Farm and at the Gables at Sheldon Corner, and also visitor accommodation at Lanhill Farm. Overall Housing Policy is clearly stated in para. 27, page 15 of the NP.	key theme. Residents are keen to encourage sustainable construction within development and want to ensure that the community is sustainable for the future and so allow residents to remain within the community for as long as they wish to do so. *Whilst* future residential development should be provided where need within the community has been demonstrated and where development is adaptable for the future, *there is no formal requirement within the Plan to develop visitor accommodation or housing for elderly residents.*"
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission,	"I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to safeguard or encourage new infrastructure?"	The NP assumes, not unreasonably, that existing infrastructure will be properly maintained by the relevant authorities holding the responsibility in question. Regarding new infrastructure farming and small scale rural businesses are the NP's economic focus	No fundamental additional statement is required, except for a clarifying sentence at the end of policy E1: "Development, where possible, should include

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:		(ref. Page 20, para 36) and these require no new or serious upgrading of roads, and in respect of home working and small scale rural businesses up-to-date internet connectivity is vital, which is both supported by the NP (ref. page 21, Policy E1) and is currently being delivered.	improvements to network provisions and internet connectivity to support sustainable work environments. *There is no formal requirement for the development of new roads or the expansion of the existing network."*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission, page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to protect existing or encourage new facilities, amenities and services – e.g. a community centre, pubs, shops, green spaces, play parks, doctors surgeries, car parking?"	The NP area is wholly rural in nature, with around 85 dwellings and a population of c. 150 persons. Whilst the NP clearly recognises (page 12, para. 20 and subsequently) the need for development of new facilities in a sustainable manner i.e. with reference to the preceding economic and population parameters, there has been no expression of need in the replies from earlier NP Questionnaires to the residents for pubs, play parks, doctors' surgery etc, and so these are not development needs; nor is there any evidence that existing facilities are experiencing any problems with their economic viability or that there is any development threat to. In respect of green spaces, such as woodlands, these are in private ownership and their development can only ever be guided by the private owners in the context of existing planning laws. Where green space assets are in public ownership, e.g. verges to the lanes, maintenance of these is subject to local government policies (e.g. mowing regime, and the	No clarification is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		Parish Council is currently seeking a biodiversity conscious regime). Notwithstanding the above detail, the NP clearly states (ref. para.34, page 18) that safeguarding, as a development principle, the experience and protection of the natural environment is an important aspect of the Plan's objectives. In respect of community facilities, such as a village hall, this was identified as a possible need in earlier NP Questionnaires and NP Policy E4 (ref. page 21) is very clear, both in terms of how the need for such new facilities will be assessed and similarly with regard to their loss and how to respond.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission, page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to protect or encourage certain types of employment in your area – e.g. are there any local businesses that want to expand? Do you want to encourage new or protect existing agricultural enterprises?"	The NP states clearly, Para 21 page 14: "By 2036 Chippenham Without and its settlements of Allington, Sheldon and Lanhill will have developed in a balanced, sustainable manner by concentrating on supporting farming as its central feature while encouraging the managed growth of its business parks for rural employment . . .." and Para 26, page 15 "Support for sustainable farming as well as businesses that are of a scale which is appropriate to the community is seen as important by local residents." This is supported by Policy E2 and E3 (page 21).	No clarification is required.
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission,	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want residents to be able to work from home (e.g. support home-office development)?"	The NP states, Para 36, page 20 "Network and infrastructure improvements which allow provision for improved home working were a theme that emerged from the Housing Needs Survey". In response NP Policy E1 (page 21) states "Development, where possible,	No clarification is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:		should include improvements to network provisions and internet connectivity to support sustainable work environments." And this is further supported by Policy E2 and its section b. Also in Para 38, page 23 (Activities and Projects to Support the Plan) and its section c, it is stated" The Plan recognises the ever-increasing requirement for good telecommunications infrastructure throughout the Neighbourhood to support many businesses, home workers, sporting amenities and general residential usage. . . .. The Parish Council will monitor and facilitate where possible the continuing rollout of good broadband connectivity."	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
General questions at the foot of WC's NP Observations submission, page 4. Each question is addressed in sequence:	" I. . . am unclear whether you: Want to promote renewable energy schemes?"	The NP recognises the existence of a 50 acre Solar Farm and a Battery-Storage facility within the plan area and that it fits within a character of land use that " . . is almost entirely given over to farming. Chiefly arable and pasture . . . but there are also a number of horse paddocks, some fields of free-range chickens and a 50 acre Solar Farm which doubles for sheep grazing . . . ." (Para 17, page 11). We did not mention the recent approval of a Battery-Storage facility connected to the grid located near the golf driving range. So a clarification to para. 17 will be incorporated. Renewable energy schemes, such as solar farms and roof installations on residential property, would be unlikely to find planning favour within the vicinity of the Allington Conservation Area as they will challenge the integrity of that protected area. However in respect of	Clarification to Para.17, page 11: " . . is almost entirely given over to farming. Chiefly arable and pasture . . . but there are also a number of horse paddocks, some fields of free-range chickens, *a small grid connected battery storage facility* and a 50 acre Solar Farm which doubles for sheep grazing . . . ." (Para 17, page 11).

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		dwellings generally other less intrusive renewable energy schemes, such as air and ground source heat pumps for business and residential properties, are being supported by the Parish Council in new planning applications e.g. currently at The Grange Lodge, Allington (within the Allington Conservation Area) and earlier at Southernwood Farm, Sheldon, and the NP recognises (Housing, Para 37, page 21) that "it is important that the Neighbourhood Plan area remains sustainable for future generations. . [and] . . support will be given to allow residents to remain in their homes as long as possible. New development must also be adaptable in order to ensure that it remains viable long-term." Renewable energy is an aspect of sustainable development, the NP clearly supports this form of development in the rural sphere (farming and small businesses) and in residential conversions and modernisation. In terms of actual promotion, that issue rests with landowners and property owners and their own financial and commercial decision making. It is not appropriate for any NP to seek to intervene directly in such decision making, but only to judge the consequences once formally proposed and the parameters for the process of formal assessment are clearly stated in the NP.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para 15, page 11.	"From a landscaping perspective, the CWNP should identify any local valued landscape features,	There is a case to amplify the landscape description in terms of topography and valued views and viewpoints in the Lanhill/Allington area, and a change in the text to Para 15, page 11 (Setting) will be inserted to clarify this	Clarification with the NP text of Para 15, page 11, to read: "The setting is one of generally undulating countryside rising

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
	elements, or specific local qualities, valued views or viewpoints that need protecting. The current draft of the plan identifies that the rural setting of the existing hamlet settlements is important for the community to conserve and protect, but it does not take the next step to identify what these settings are and what they should be used for."	– see NP Text clarification column. In terms of identifying these rural settings which the community may wish to protect, these are amply recorded in the NP by the pictures on page 6 (Allington), 7 and 9 (aerial views, Allington), 10 (Lanhill Long Barrow and surrounding landscape,), 11 (Fowlswick Farm, Lanhill and Allington, aerial view), 12 (Sheldon and Allington alongside southern section of A350, aerial view), 15 (Allington, north easterly aerial view from Manor Farm), 18 (Allington, alongside northern section of A350, aerial view),and page 24 (Allington lane, at northern end looking west). Thus these rural settings are abundantly recorded in the NP document, and all demonstrate clearly the rural nature of the parish and the views from these vantage points. The Plan explicitly states at many places throughout the NP document that it is predominantly a rural area and that its rural nature is to be protected. Additionally, the Allington Conservation Area Statement (ref. NP Para. 5 and NP Annex N, page 35) possesses a detailed landscape analysis and catalogues the views to be protected at Allington and the surrounding area (ref. Conservation Area Statement, pages 15 and 16) and the Conservation Area Statement is a central document to the NP. Thus the NP does record what these landscape settings and views are (notwithstanding, the fore-mentioned clarification to NP Para 15), and that it is their rural nature which is to be protected within the context of any development proposal.	gently from the borders of Chippenham along either side of Allington lane up to Shipway's Brake. The land rises similarly up past Sheldon Manor to Sheldon Wood feature and *on* to Lanhill *which is the highest point in the parish with views east as far as the Cherhill White Horse beyond Calne.* The Parish is split by two brooks, Hardenhuish and Pudding Brooks, both of which eventually join the River Avon which flows through Chippenham."

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 35, page 19.	"From a design point of view, the draft neighbourhood plan offers an opportunity to resolve design issues in a local way . . . Officers suggest that more importance could be placed on the neighbourhood plan area providing an important rural setting to the eastern side of the Cotswold national landscape. The Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) special qualities extend into the plan area.. . The plan area (or just parts of it) might also be identified as providing essential rural landscape separation between Chippenham's expanding urban settlement and influences/pressures for growth and the Cotswold National Landscape/Cotswold ANOB designation."	There is validity in drawing clear attention that Chippenham Without has significance as a rural area which not just demarcates the rural area from the urban development of Chippenham (ref. Chippenham Site Allocations Plan, NP. Para 5 and listed in the NP appendix) but also constitutes a rural area that separates the outer boundary of Chippenham on its eastern side from the Cotswold national landscape (ANOB) which lies on the northern boundary of Chippenham Without and the adjoining parish of Yatton Keynell, and that Chippenham Without takes many of its built design features from the Cotswold national landscape (ref. NP Para 35, The Built Environment, page19). Thus the Steering Group sees value in clarifying both of these points: association with the Cotswold national landscape and a similar association in the parish's built design features.	The NP text will be clarified in NP para 15, page 11, Setting, to read: ". . . . It is essentially a very rural Neighbourhood of approaching 230 people (208 in 2011 census) living in 83 dwellings around the three hamlets of Allington, Sheldon and Lanhill*. The parish's eastern boundary alongside the A350 forms a distinct rural boundary that separates the parish's rural landscape from the urban development of Chippenham, whilst the parish's northern border marks and reflects a transition into the characteristics of the Cotswolds national landscape (ANOB).* The setting is one of . . . .". Also, the NP text will be clarified in Para 35, page 19, Built Environment, to read: "This Plan aims to conserve the quality of the built environment whilst ensuring that development provides enhancements to it and the landscape, reinforcing the locally distinctive character and respecting the vernacular *which reflects the design features of the Cotswolds national landscape and*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
			these design features are clearly documented in the Allington Conservation Area Statement. It is important for the future to balance traditional design and the use of traditional building materials with . . . .".
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para 35, page 19.	"You might also want to identify what design has and has not worked well for your community in the past. . . . Having an up to date, specific and clear design guide within the neighbourhood plan will prevent this type of incongruous development happening again."	The argument being advanced here is understood. In fact the recording of such design standards is already recorded in the Allington Conservation Area Statement where design standards covering pitch of rooves, non-interference with views and landscape features, use of materials, architectural design details and material colours are all specified, along with illustrated examples of both good and poor practice, and this Conservation Area Statement is a key NP reference document. The NP already shows examples of these principles in photographs throughout the plan, notably on pages 8,13, 15 and 20. However we see virtue in drawing greater attention to this aspect in a enlargement of this matter in NP para 35, Built Environment .	The NP text will be clarified in the final sentence of para 35. Built Environment, to read: "Examples of builds adhering to these principles are shown in photographs throughout the plan *[delete* but], specifically on Pages 8, 13, 15 and 20 *and these design standards are set out clearly in the Allington Conservation Area Statement.*"
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Annex D, page 32.	"You may wish to acknowledge that the neighbourhood plan area is also covered by the 'Wiltshire Landscape	The way the NP is structured does not admit such a possibility of incorporating into the text of Core Policy 51, as suggested here. However, the Landscape evidence base is covered in Annex D of the Neighbourhood Plan where the reference and link given	Annex D to be clarified to include the following listing: *Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment: https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-landscape-conservation*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
	Assessment' (which is listed alongside the already referenced 'North Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment') within the supporting text of Core Policy 51: Landscape."	is the 'North Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment'. We will include in Annex D an additional link to the 'Wiltshire Landscape Assessment'.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Annex D, page 32	"'The Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) Project' . . . may provide a further or future additional source of local information."	This observation is understood. 'The Wiltshire and Swindon HLC Project' will also be listed in Annex D, page 32 of the NP.	Annex D to be clarified to include the following listing: *The Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Landscape Characterisation Project: https://arcaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/Wiltshire_hlc_2017/*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 38 and 39, page 23. Also, Policies NE1 and NE2, The Natural Environment, Para. 34, page 18.	"The draft plan talks about developing community facilities and engaging the community in decisions. It also talks of being a leisure destination and 'green lung' for Chippenham. When talking about development there is not a strong link to using S106 developer contributions to upgrade/develop sports and	It is correct to observe that "Enabling local residents to experience the natural environment is an important aspect of this plan's objectives. . . the Plan aims to deliver on a set of ideals, focusing on ensuring the rural setting is respected through any development within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Residents have highlighted the importance of maintaining and enhancing the landscape for the enjoyment of the local community and the wider community of Chippenham" - as stated in NP para. 38, and this is amplified in both Policies NE1 and NE2. In terms of 'Activities and Projects to Support the Plan', it is envisaged that the Parish	No additional clarification is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
	playing pitch or ancilliary services provision. There could also be stronger references made to the health and wellbeing of the community and role community leisure infrastructure can have."	Council will support (ref. NP para. 38) the Plan through the development of Working Groups reporting to the Parish Council (for example, ref. Para 38 section a/. on lane management, and section b/. on rights of way management), and in relation to Projects (re. NP para. 39) in connection with community facilities (ref. Para 39, section a/.). Regarding S106 money, the NP does not advocate any development that would result in S106 money, therefore no specific attention is felt warranted. If such money were to occur, NP Para 39 outlines the community facilities it might likely support which includes the sports facilities at the Chippenham Rugby and Cricket Clubs. Regarding policies on the health and well being of the community, it is considered that maintenance of the rural nature of the area and access to it via public right of way does, by logical implication, support the physical and mental well-being of the local residents and the wider community of Chippenham. Keeping the lanes and rights of way in good order (ref. NP Para 38, section a/. and b/.) ensures good access for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and others, and contributes to local and wider community health and well-being without straying into specific 'health policies' which the NP Steering Group does not consider to be within the Plan's province. Therefore it is considered that the issues raised by the Wiltshire Council observations are fully and sensibly covered in the Plan.	

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Front and Back Covers.	For the submission draft plan, the front cover of the document must include the plan period e.g. 2022 – 2036 and make it clear that this is a 'draft' version.	This amendment will be made.	Covers amended to read: *Chippenham Without draft Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036.*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Contents Page.	The contents page should list the objectives and policies and include page numbers so relevant parts of the document can be easily identified.	The Contents Page (NP page 4) will be amended to include the page number where the item commences. To include also a list of policies and objectives under the 'Key Objectives' and 'Plan Policies' would overburden the Contents Page and is not considered necessary. Details of both are readily available at their respective pages.	Each Contents Page listing will be amended, as follows: *Introduction, page 5, and so forth . . ."*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Vision, Objectives and Policies.	"It is important . . . that the vision, objectives and policies can be easily identified. I recommend putting the vision, objectives and policies in coloured text boxes so that they stand out from the supporting text."	The Titles for The Vision, Key Objectives, and Plan Policies for Supporting the Objectives are already in colour highlight, as are the listing titles of each Plan Policy. The subject areas covered by 'The Vision' (NP page 14), are each given a paragraph number and a heading in black bold e.g.**21. Overview; 22. Topic Areas; 23. The Historic Environment** and so forth. Their prominence is considered to be clear, and so their presentation is considered to be sufficient but, to increase it, they will also be capitalised. 'The Key Objectives To Achieve The Vision' (NP, page	No additional clarification is required, except for an underlining of headings and a capitalisation of each, noting that they are already in bold. It is not felt additional colour texting is required in the light of the foregoing changes.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		16) also have their paragraph number and heading in black bold and will be capitalised e.g. **28 Historic Environment,** and so forth. Additionally all Key Objectives are contained on one page (NP, page 16), so ensuring clarity and accessibility. In the case of 'Plan Policies Supporting The Objectives' (NP, page 17 ff), the overall title and also each individual policy is highlighted within a coloured box using large lettering in white within the coloured box. Additionally, each overall Policy and paragraph number are in black bold e.g.**33. Historic Environment.** These factors combined ensure that clarity is strong, and that individual policies occupy distinctive spaces with the overall text. This means of overall presentation is considered sound. However, as mentioned, to strengthen it we will include underlining of these headings .	

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Policies, page 17 ff.	"Review where the words 'should' and 'must' have been used in policies and understand the reason for using one or the other. Be consistent in employing each term."	The terms 'should' and 'must' are considered to be essential requirements, i.e. meaning that these NP Policies must be deployed in matters concerning development and delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore in the interests of consistency this WC observation is accepted, and use of 'must' will become the default terminology. This will ensure clarification of the draft NP's original intention.	Amend the NP Policies to remove 'should' and replace with 'must' as required, e.g. NP Policy NE1 (page 18) which currently reads "Development proposals should: . . ." and is to be clarified to read "*Development proposals must: . . . . ".*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 5, page 5: The Need for a Neighbourhood Plan	"Suggest removing the reference to Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals and Waste Core Strategy as this is not particularly relevant . . . . . The plan period aligns with the emerging Local Plan . . . however, there is no mention of the Local Plan review in the text."	The Local Plan review is to be mentioned in NP para 5, page 5 as notified earlier (page 10 of this response to the Council's observations). Whilst the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has no immediate relevance to this Neighbourhood Plan, this is a key background document which records effectively that the parish is not central to the concerns of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Hence listing of this particular Core Strategy will be retained in order to indicate this in the event of some development proposal subsequently emerging.	Page 5, para 5 will include: "*The Wiltshire Local Plan (emerging)".*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 6, page 6: Preparation of the Plan	"Community engagement has clearly taken place, but the major sources of evidence were gathered in 2016 (questionnaire) and 2018 (housing needs assessment). You may wish to undertake more community engagement and update the vision, objectives and policies in line with feedback received. If you do so, you will need to repeat the regulation 14 pre-submission stage."	This observation has overlooked the fact that the NP Steering Group undertook a second full public consultation/questionnaire by post in 2020 with all residents in the parish on the draft Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that the Plan had assent and/or needed any amendment before the Regulation 14 stage, and the results of this 2020 questionnaire were circulated to all residents by post on 1st December 2020. This specific document has been one of the key reference documents listed on the Parish Council website with respect to the current Regulation 14 public consultation. Therefore the evidence base *is* up to date for the Regulation 14 stage.	No additional action is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 11, page 9 and Annex O, page 35/37.	"Reference to a full list of the plan area's historic assets, including listed buildings in Annex K is welcomed. It would be beneficial to include a map of these also within the main body of the plan."	The correct Annex is O, not K, and this amendment to the NP will be made, both at para. 11 and wherever else is necessary. We have noted that we have not listed the Scheduled Historic Monuments in the Plan area in Annex L and this correction will be made. These include the Long Barrow at Lanhill, the Romano-British Farmstead at Allington, and the Medieval Settlement at Sheldon. The suggestion of a map has been considered. However there are 34 Grade I/II listed buildings in the Plan area and 3 Scheduled Historic Monuments. This would make any such map very crowded and the task of clearly recording each item accurately for the user very difficult. Therefore we will be amending Annex O to include the postcode for each Grade I/II listing as the postcode provides the reader with good accuracy of location, especially when used in conjunction with an online search machine. We will be also amending the title of Annex O to include 'Scheduled Historic Monuments' and providing in Annex L the Historic England online link which provides a map of the location of the monument, a full description of the monument along with its Ordnance Survey grid reference. We will also provide within the NP an Archaeological Map of the principal recorded finds, including the Scheduled Historic Mounments. Reference to this new Map will be made in Annex O.	Clarification of Para 11 to refer to *Annex O*, not K. Clarification of Annex O to read: 'Heritage- List of Listed Buildings *and Scheduled Historic Monuments.*' Clarification of each listed building in Annex O to read [for example] : '1. Grade II: Allington House Chippenham Without, Wiltshire *SN14 6LN.*' Clarification of Annex O to include the Scheduled Historic Monuments, as follows: *Lanhill Long Barrow, Scheduled Historic Monument, see details at:* *https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1010908* *Allington Romano-British Farmstead, Scheduled Historic Monument, see:* *https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1425267* *Sheldon Medieval Settlement, Scheduled Historic Monument, see:* *https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1018428* *Archaeological Map, over on page 37.* *Listed Buildings, Source:* *https://britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/england/chippenham-without-wiltshire#XZ41wx8VDcs* , *See over on pages 38 and 39.*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 16, page 11 and also page 5. Also Annex J, page 31.	"It would be useful to include a map of the roads and public rights of way. Do you propose any new links?"	A map of the Plan area is provided on page 5 of the NP. This incorporates all the roads – Class A roads (red), B roads (dark yellow) and C roads (light yellow). No additional clarification is thought to be necessary. In the matter of rights of way, Annex I currently provides an online link to the Wiltshire Council Record of Rights of Way and, via this means, a map of the NP area can be accessed which records all the rights of way in the Plan area and their status, e.g. footpath, bridle way. This is a strong map. An example detail of Chippenham Without Parish with Rights of Way is shown on page 35, and a web link is provided. To include all the Rights of Way in the NP sourced from this link would require a much bigger entry in the NP which would be unwieldy. There is also a link to the Ordnance Survey, a link to which is currently in the NP under Annex H. Also, a large number of NP footpaths and bridleways either do not start within the plan area or finish within the plan area, and knowing this is essential to their use. Thus any map provided within the NP itself would have to be substantially larger than the NP area in order to incorporate this information, so additionally making such a map impractical for the NP document itself. However the Steering Group recognises that the Wiltshire Council observation is seeking improvement over the current information provided in the NP, and so the Neighbourhood Plan will provide the following clarification. It will incorporate within the Plan under Annex J a tabulated list of all Rights of Way within the Plan area, their formal designation as to character of use and, in order to ensure that this information has	The NP will be clarified under Annex I to include: *Annex I - Wiltshire Public Rights of Way - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way* The NP will be clarified under Annex J to include *a tabulated list of all rights of way within the plan area, their status e.g. footpath or bridle way, and the OS grid reference recording their starting and finishing point.* And include the following information: *References:* *OS Map 156 Chippenham and Bradford-on-Avon 1: 25,000 Public Rights of Way in Chippenham Without Ordnance Survey 100049050 dated 06/09/2021* *Rights of Way Link: https://wiltscouncil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=43d5a86a545046b2b59fd7dd49d89d22* *Note:* *Purple denotes Footpath* *Green denotes Bridlepath*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		practicality, also the OS grid reference where the right of way both commences and finishes, which is often located outside the plan area. We will nevertheless explore the possibility of producing a map of the rights of way which records their full nature, i.e. links to neighbouring parishes. This would allow for a larger sized map, but it would be external to the NP document itself, it would be available on the Parish Council website, and a link to it would be provided in Annex J of the NP main document.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 21, section b/., page 14.	"The vision provides a clear statement of intent. However, there are a couple of points which might need clarifying/amending: ◦ 'Housing development will have met the needs of the current population within the plan area . . .' – What about the <u>future</u> population too? ◦ ' . . . by enabling families to live near . . .' – What about individuals/couples? ◦' . . . enhance the locally distinctive character of the settlements.'	◦In respect of meeting the housing needs of the current and future population : There is no evidence of externally motivated development (i.e. no external planning targets or development proposals) within the plan area for residential purposes, nor any proposals from within the plan area (i.e. residents, ref. NP Questionnaires 1 and 2 and Housing Needs Survey) for any residential development beyond the immediate needs of residents and their families and businesses (predominantly farming) other than to provide for immediate personal need (e.g. provision for old age and 'tied' residential accommodation, see NP Policy H1 [Housing]). Also, the population of the plan area (the three hamlets of the parish) has remained very stable over the past 20 years and has shown no expansionary tendency. Therefore to confine the provision of housing need to the current population is the only evidence base that has any clear definition, and any focus on	The NP Vision statement, para 21, page 14, section b/. will be clarified to read: 'Housing development will have met the needs of the current population within the plan area by enabling families *and individuals* to live near their places of work in the neighbourhood through sensitive infill and extension or by conversion of existing buildings, while taking care to conserve and enhance the locally distinctive character of the settlements'.

	- What do you mean by this? Where is it set out in the plan?"	future need from external sources has no evidence base and thus no definition. Hence, the focus of the NP on the 'current' situation rather than the 'future' situation. This analysis is confirmed by the results from NP Questionnaires 1 and 2 and the Housing Needs Survey, and justifies the NP's vision statement on this point. Hence no additional clarification is required. ◦ In respect of individuals/couples, as opposed to just families, being able to live near their places of work in the neighbourhood through sensitive infill and extension or by conversion of existing buildings, the NP will be clarified to include the word 'individuals' and not just 'families'. ◦ In respect of 'Housing development will have met the needs of the current population within the Plan area . . .*while taking care to conserve and enhance the locally distinctive character of the settlements*' this aspect of the Vision is, in the first instance, set out above by the clear definition of acceptable reasons for housing development; and, in the second instance, is set out clearly in NP Policies HE 1 and 2 (Historic Environment), in NP Policies NE 1 and 2 (Natural Environment) and in NP Policies BE 1, 2 and 3 (Built Environment) and NP Policy H2 (Housing); and, in the third instance, by the Allington Conservation Area Statement in the Statement's Parts 2 and 3 and, in particular the Development Guidelines and enhancement Proposals in Part 4 of the Conservation Area Statement. Accordingly no additional clarification is required.	

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 21, section b/. page 14, The Vision.	"How is the vision achieved through the neighbourhood plan policies? Some questions to consider: ◦ 'How will farming be supported?' ◦ 'How will people be encouraged to live near their place of work (e.g. will there be a policy for home office development)?' ◦'How will the plan encourage sensitive infill, extension and/or conversion of existing buildings? What do you want to see/achieve?' ◦ 'What are the sustainability and biodiversity policies (or are you relying on existing policies in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, in which case this is just replication/ unnecessary)?'	◦ In respect of farming, the Plan does not have specific policies for farming nor is it the intention of the Plan to do so. The support of farming is controlled and directed by policies at higher tiers of government, particularly national. This is their province, not ours. Having said that, the Plan *does* recognise farming as the central and dominant economic pillar of this community. This fact, along with the fact that the Plan seeks to support sensible, sustainable changes in farming policy and practice will be planning principles available to the Parish Council and others whenever their opinion is consulted and is to be taken into account in decision-making - thus affirming that support for farming is one of the Plan's fundamental pillars, see NP Policy E3. ◦ In respect of people being encouraged to live near to their place of work and encouragement for home office development, the essential point is that the Plan neither does, nor seeks, to specifically encourage either. That is not the purpose of the Plan. Rather its purpose is to support and facilitate those proposals, both generally (i.e. infrastructure) or individually (i.e. planning applications), which seek to achieve these objectives and which are, when they arise, of a reasonable and sustainable nature. ◦ In respect of sensitive infill, extension and/or conversion of existing buildings, it is not the policy of the Plan to enter into active promotion of such proposals, but rather to favour them when they are reasonable and sustainably proposed. ◦ In respect of sustainability and biodiversity policies, the Plan affirms the centrality of the Wiltshire Core Strategy policies towards development within the Plan	No clarification beyond existing statements (Vision) and detailed NP policies is necessary.

		area, and this affirmation of their centrality is important in terms of the principles at the heart of the Plan. Hence their affirmation is not mere duplication. Sustainability and biodiversity policy are not matters that the Plan itself takes pro-active action upon, but rather they exist as core policies within the Plan by which to judge future development proposals and their acceptability. In brief, the ambition of the Vision, para 21, section b/. is one of establishing principles by which development will be assessed when it arises, rather than being a pro-active inducer of behaviour. Hence no additional clarification is required beyond existing statements of principle and objectives and policy.	+
NP Page/Para. ref.	**NP Page/Para. ref.**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para 21, section c/., The Vision	" Part 'c' of the vision talks about green spaces, public rights of way and heritage assets. You reference public rights of way and heritage assets in the main text but there is no mention of the existing green spaces and where they are. A map (or maps) of these assets would be beneficial in the evidence base section of the plan."	The public rights of way will be listed and annotated with regard to their starting and finishing Ordnance Survey grid references and tabulated in the evidence section of the Plan. The heritage assets will have their list extended to include the 3 Scheduled Historic Monuments in the Plan area with onward links to background details, including location and maps, and the Grade I and II Listed buildings will be annotated with their postcode thus facilitating their location online maps responsive to this information. See earlier comments in this regard and changes to be made to the Plan text and annexes. These are essentially clarifications rather than alterations in the purpose of the Plan. With regard to green spaces, production of an accurate small scale map (one page covering the Plan area) would not be practical for reasons of accuracy and excessive crowding as earlier explained in a mapping of historic buildings, and the best way a user of the	Clarification of Para 11 to refer to *Annex O*, not K. Clarification of Annex O to read: 'Heritage- List of Listed Buildings *and Scheduled Historic Monuments.*' Clarification of each listed building in Annex O to read [for example] : '1. Grade II: Allington House Chippenham Without, Wiltshire *SN14 6LN.*' Clarification of Annex O to include the Scheduled Historic Monuments, as follows: *Lanhill Long Barrow, Scheduled Historic Monument, see details at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1010908 Allington Romano-British*

		Neighbourhood Plan can understand and locate these accurately (i.e. woodlands) is via use of the Ordnance Survey map (172) which also provides a map of rights of way affording access. The Ordnance Survey link is provided in Annex H. The need of identification is best met by this means. We will nevertheless explore the possibility of producing a map of the green spaces, as we are for historic assets and public rights of way which would allow for a larger sized map, but it would be external to the NP document itself. It would likely be the product of one of the tasks of the Working Groups which could be established by the Parish Council, ref. NP para. 39, following adoption of the NP and it would become available subsequently on the Parish Council website.	*Farmstead, Scheduled Historic Monument, see:* *https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1425267* *Sheldon Medieval Settlement, Scheduled Historic Monument, see:* *https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1018428* In respect of green spaces, no additional clarification is necessary, but we have now included the postcodes for the recreational clubs, (rugby, cricket and golf) in Para 13. Page 10.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 23, page 14	"Reference is made to preserving the historic character of the parish but there is no explanation of what the character is at this point in the plan. This would benefit from either a cross reference to supporting text which explains what the character is, or a summary of the character at this point?"	The preceding paragraph in the Plan, para 22. Topic Areas, identifies The Historic Environment as a specific topic with associated policies, and the number of this page is included in the Contents Page of the Plan (page 4). Therefore locating this information within the Plan is not difficult. Also, Para. 23 to which the WC observation refers is part of The Vision section of the Plan, and it is not appropriate to go into detail in this section because, firstly, it would make the section unnecessarily cumbersome and secondly would create unnecessary repetition. However we will include a reference in NP para 23 to the historical outline of the parish in NP para 8 to 14.	No additional clarification is necessary, beyond the following clarification to para. 23: "**The Historic Environment**- The Neighbourhood Plan area has a number of designated heritage assets, *see Annex O,* as well as the Allington Conservation Area. This heritage defines the unique character of Allington, Sheldon and Chippenham Without, *see NP paras 8 to 14*, and is the reason why the area remains a great place to live, work and visit. The community wants to preserve this heritage and enhance the historic character of the Parish."

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Topic Areas	"A neighbourhood plan is an opportunity for a community to consider its future in a proactive way. There are many issues that could be considered. Whilst it may not be desirable or appropriate to incorporate everything within the neighbourhood plan, I wonder if there are further areas that the community and parish council could consider. For example, renewable energy schemes, protection of existing or new local green spaces, support for new working-from-home spaces. Other aspirations/needs might be identified through further community engagement."	The scope of the Plan, both in terms of topics covered and the policies relating to them, have been carefully researched and defined as a result of two comprehensive questionnaires with the parish residents. Details of both are in the evidence base to this plan, ref Annex F and Annex G. The Plan has been designed carefully, with professional assistance, within these clearly evidenced parameters. Thus the Plan is the product of a very strong evidence base, and does not need further community engagement. This conclusion has been reinforced by the third (Regulation 14) public consultation which has shown no dissent from this earlier researched evidence base, nor any dissent on the conclusions based on it as exemplified by the vision, the policies and objectives which now constitute the Plan.	No additional action is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Key Objectives to achieve the Vision, Para 28 to 32, page 16.	"The objectives, in combination, should support the delivery of the vision. The current list of objectives is comprehensive but could be made 'smarter' and more precise if they were amalgamated."	The objectives are all contained within a single page within the Plan, ref. page 16. Coverage is therefore concise in this respect. Key Objectives are listed via Topic Area (with an individual paragraph number), and these Topic Areas cannot be amalgamated without causing confusion. Within each topic area and their respective paragraph, the individual policies are each concisely presented. Any amalgamation in this concise listing would cause confusion.	No additional action is warranted.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Key Objectives to achieve the Vision, Para 28 to 32, page 16	"The reference to Wiltshire Council Core policies in brackets after each objective (and policy) is commendable but not necessary. I think it adds a layer of complexity and potential confusion/conflict. For example, CP50 relates to 'biodiversity and geodiversity' so is not particularly relevant to objectives that relate to the historic environment. I recommend removing the policy references entirely."	It has been felt important, in the light of the fact that the NP needs to be in conformity with Plans existing at higher tiers of government, to not just observe this but to demonstrate its actuality in the case of the NP. This is why it is felt that citing WC Core Policy Plans and referencing them to NP Policies is both essential and useful. It is a dimension of supporting the evidence base. In the case of CP50, this states: 'Development proposals must demonstrate how they protect features of nature conservation and geological value as part of the design rationale. There is an expectation that such features shall be retained, buffered, and managed favourably in order to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. Where it has been demonstrated that such features cannot be retained, removal or damage shall only be acceptable in circumstances where the anticipated ecological impacts have been mitigated as far as possible and appropriate compensatory measures can be secured to ensure no net loss of the local biodiversity resource, and secure the integrity of local ecological networks and provision of ecosystem services. . . .' This is clearly a key WC Core Policy with respect to this NP and this relevance applies to the historic rural landscape of the	Clarification: *Annex B, NP page 28*, to include: *Core Policy 50 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity.*

		parish, and thus its inclusion as a reference in Para. 28 and other parts of the NP, including Annex B, is warranted.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 33, page 17, Historic Environment.	"The supporting text talks about rural character, agricultural landscape/buildings and heritage assets [as] important features but the policies are generic/vague. What do you actually want the policies to deliver? The lane is mentioned as being special in Allington but the reader has no clarification as to why the lane is distinct or special. Suggest a cross reference or summary should be provided." "The policies do not reference the Allington conservation area and the need to comply with the requirements of this designation if development were to fall within it. It would be helpful if the plan included a map of the Conservation Area."	NP Policies set the key overriding principles governing development and management of assets within the plan area, and the Plan with its policies is not a manual that records all the details. If this were so, the Plan would become unwieldy, and where would lie the boundary between what detail to include or omit? The detail is to be found in the relevant documents appertaining to those assets, and the NP provides the links and references which allows the user of the Plan to access that detail. This is as it should be. Take Allington lane for example, cited in the WC observation, this detail is included in the Allington Conservation Area Statement, ref. Section 3.1, pages 21 to 24 inclusive, and this covers not only a character analysis of the lane, but also a record of significant features, development guidelines and enhancement proposals. All this detail is available, simply by using the links provided in the NP. Regarding a map of the Allington Conservation Area, this is available in the Conservation Area Statement, and the NP provides access to this Statement via the link in the NP at Annex N. Once again, the function of the Neighbourhood Plan is to concentrate on the key aspects and to providing links to the detail. The Plan is not an archive in itself nor should it be, as that function is served by the Plan's links to others who provide this archive.	No change is required as the function of the Plan is clear and its evidence base is carefully and concisely recorded.

NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Historic Environment, NP Policy HE1, page 17.	"What do you mean by 'good quality design' and 'local character'? Where is this defined/set out in the plan?"	Both good quality design and local character with respect to building design are evidenced in the listed building themselves within the NP area, with development of those buildings, or development likely to affect them, being required under planning law to respect those features. This is amplified in the Allington Conservation Area Statement, section 4.3, pages 40 to 42 inclusive where examples of both good and poor design are provided, both in text and by photographs. The NP provides links to both the Listed Buildings and the Allington Conservation Area Statement. These are key reference links.	No additional clarification is required.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Historic Environment, NP Policy HE2, page 17.	"This policy appears to say the same thing as HE1 which is unnecessary repetition. Can the two be amalgamated? If not, why not? What is the key difference between the two policies? Why do they need to be separate?"	The key objectives for the Historic Environment (re. NP para. 28, page 17) are three fold. One (KO-HE-1) to conserve and enhance the distinctive characteristics of the historic rural landscape. Two (KO-HE-2) to conserve and enhance the Allington Conservation Area and adjoining land. Three (KO-HE-3) to facilitate the protection of the parish's heritage assets. Both Policy HE1 and HE2 reflect these objectives and so it is correct to observe that they have a great deal of commonality, but it will be observed that HE1 is particularly focused on 'local character' and, in terms of its individuality separating it from HE2, this means in particular a focus on Key Objective KO-HE-I : to conserve and enhance the distinctive characteristics of *the historic rural landscape* [emphasis added]. This is the point of focus in Policy HE1 in the term 'local character' and this is this policy's	Policy HE1 to be clarified to read: "All new development within the neighbourhood plan Area must demonstrate good quality design by demonstrating a positive response to the local character *of the historic rural landscape.*"

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		distinctive difference from Policy HE2 where the emphasis is on the 'historic built and natural environment'. We agree that this difference is not sufficiently clear at the moment in order to implement the Historic Environment Key Objectives, and therefore Policy HE 1 will be clarified in order to make its focus on the historic rural landscape, as distinct from the built and natural environment (Policy HE2), wholly clear.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Natural Environment, NE1, page 18.	""This policy would be stronger if it was made clear exactly what local character and views you are aiming to protect? A plan of existing rights of way and any proposed new routes/links would ensure they are known early by any potential developer/project. What sort of landscape enhancements do you want? What do you mean by 'appropriate species mix and character'/ Do you mean native species, if so what are they?"	As explained above, policies in the Neighbourhood Plan are not manuals which describe the fine detail but rather are statements of overarching principle. This applies here to NE1 and to WC's specific observation. Local character in terms of the rural landscape along with built and historic environment and a record of rights of way are strongly evidenced by existing reference documents in the Plan, as previously described and cited, and so any developer or project will have no difficulty in accessing this information provided they consult the NP which, in turn, we assume the parish council and other planning authorities will expect the developer/project to have done, and to do so if they have not. Policy NE1 is, as are other NP policies, worded to require compliance e.g. 'Development proposals must . . .'. Regarding trees and use of native species, the policy does not seek to be proscriptive, and so no stipulation is made – other than the selection must demonstrate 'appropriateness' which can then be judged on an individual development/project basis.	No additional clarification is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Natural Environment, NE2 a/., page 18.	"How will development (e.g. infill, extension or conversion) deliver biodiversity net gains? Do you want new development (including extensions) to include wildlife enhancement measures, e.g. bird boxes etc? Through the Environment Act 2021, a mandatory 10% biodiversity net gain for all developments will come into force in 2023. This 10% is a minimum requirement and therefore there is the opportunity for the CWNP to see a minimum percentage that all new developments would be expected to deliver."	As stated, the purpose of the NP is not to define the detail in terms of a manual, but rather to establish the overarching principle governing development and this applies to policy NE2. In respect of what constitutes a 'biodiversity net gain' this is established by higher planning legislation which any planning application/project will need to comply. With reference to the WC observation regarding the Environment Act 2021, higher tiers of government will produce a 'biodiversity metric' and this will define better than any attempt by the NP what the meaning of this is: e.g. Environment Act 2021, Schedule 14, page 226, para. 4(2) : 'The biodiversity metric is to be produced and published by the Secretary of State.' The NP, as will all other planning authorities, respond accordingly upon issuance of guidance by the Secretary of State. This may be regarded as a logical planning assumption, and does not require specific attention in the NP.	No additional clarification is required.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Natural Environment, NE2 b/., page 18.	"What do you mean by 'enhance geodiversity'? How will an applicant show that they have done this?"	It is accurate to observe that geological features and conditions are not usually amenable to enhancement, but they do require protection from damage as a result of development because such features are key determinants in the nature of local habitat character and thus biodiversity. Thus it makes sense to reword	The text of Policy NE2, b/. will be altered to read: " *Protect* geodiversity where possible."

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		this aspect of Policy NE 2 b/. to one of protection, rather than enhancement. How an applicant demonstrates such is an issue which the applicant, knowing that this point must be addressed due to its relevance to biodiversity, will have freedom to address as they see appropriate within the context of their planning application/project, and it will be assessed accordingly for compliance.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Natural Environment, NE2 c/., page 18.	"Best practice in Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) is another broad statement, already captured in Strategic Objective 6 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. SUDS come in all sorts of different characters. The neighbourhood plan is the opportunity to say what type you would prefer to see and why and set requirements (e.g. what sort of planting you want associated with them). Otherwise, it will be developer-led and cost engineered."	The nature of sustainable urban drainage (i.e. for built development of houses, roads, etc) is greatly determined by the scale of the development. In the case of the NP no large development (housing, infrastructure, etc) is proposed, so the impact of drainage from new development is not likely to be significant. As the NP is not a manual, as earlier addressed, and as the scale of development is likely to be very limited there is little justification for a detailed consideration of this issue within the Plan itself. Where drainage is an issue accompanying a development proposal within the Plan area, Policy NE 2 c/. requires that best practice (defined elsewhere by planning authorities and practitioners) will be required. Thus wording of this section of Policy NE2 is considered adequate for the Plan's needs.	No additional clarification is required.

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 35, page 19, The Built Environment.	"In the last sentence of para.35 on page 19 'on' is spelt incorrectly."	Agreed.	Text correction: "Examples of builds adhering to these principles are shown in photographs throughout the plan but specifically *on* Pages 8, 13, 15 and 20."
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 35, page 19, BE1 , The Built Environment.	"Why will proposals that coalesce settlements not be supported? What is the purpose of this policy and what are you trying to achieve?"	The historic and rural character of the parish and Plan area is founded on three distinct settlements – Allington, Sheldon and Lanhill as the section of the plan titled 'Chippenham Without Parish – The Settlements And Their History' NP paras. 8 to 14 sets out. Thus preventing coalescence is in accord with these settlements' history and the area's rural nature. Indeed, coalescence could only be achieved by large scale development - a policy to which this Plan is resistant in principle. Hence such proposals will not be supported."	No clarification required.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 35, page 19, BE2 , The Built Environment.	"The policy references 'sustainable construction' but there isn't a description of what that might actually constitute (other than a single reference to 're-use of materials'. Neither does the policy set out how proposals which don't constitute	In planning terms, endorsed by higher tier planning authorities, sustainable construction has the following features: it means using renewable and recyclable materials when building new structures, as well as reducing energy consumption and waste. The primary goal of sustainable construction is to reduce a development's impact on the environment. Sustainability in development should also look to the future lifespan of the development, and not just the time of its immediate construction so that this requirement	Text clarification: New final sentence to Para. 35, page 19: "Development proposals that constitute sustainable construction will be supported; *features and requirements are shown at Annex M."* New *Annex M,* page 36. "*Annex M . . . What is Sustainable*

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
	sustainable construction be regarded."	for sustainable construction does not end when the building is complete, but should also aim for the building/ development to have a reduced impact on the environment over its lifespan. These can include proper insulation to prevent heat loss, solar panels to reduce energy consumption, low-carbon heating systems and building materials with a long lifespan. Once again, this Plan is not a manual, but a statement of over-arching principle. Therefore more detailed amplification of this concept is not necessary in the Plan itself, as the definition is already established by higher tiers of planning authorities. By implication, development proposals which do not seek to embrace sustainable construction are unlikely to be favoured when seeking planning consent – which is what Policy BE 2 implies when it says that proposals which 'constitute sustainable construction . . . will be supported'. However to assist users of the Neighbourhood Plan we will provide an Annex with a link to the British Assessment Bureau which provides access to the ISO standards on sustainable construction.	*Construction: https://www.british-assessment.co.uk/insights/what-is-sustainable-construction-and-why-is-it-important/".*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 35, page 19, BE3 , The Built Environment.	"What types of materials would respond to the local vernacular? Where are the heritage assets – suggest showing these on a map? What do you mean by 'appropriate' scale and 'appropriate' materials?"	As previously explained, materials responding to the local vernacular are clearly evidenced in the Allington Conservation Area Statement and are also evidenced by the Grade I/II listed buildings in the Plan area. Regarding a map of heritage assets, this has earlier been responded to and all heritage assets are now accompanied by a postcode in their Annex O listing. The term 'appropriate' derives its meaning from the	No additional clarification required.

		environmental, built and landscape context in which the development occurs, and this context will vary from one development proposal to another. Therefore meaning of the term has to be defined on an individual case basis and in relation to its context.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 36, page 21, Policy E1, The Economy.	"The words 'where possible' mean that this policy can be easily 'ignored'. What information should applicants provide?"	It is accepted that this current wording allows the obligation to be ignored, therefore the policy will be reworded to require it to be an aim. The term 'should' will be retained because whether a development can attain the aim of improvement to network provisions and internet connectivity may be determined by factors outside the development's control. The information required is such as is sufficient to ensure that the development has endeavoured to comply with the policy.	The text will be clarified to read: "Development should *aim to* include improvements to network provisions and internet connectivity to support sustainable work environments. *There is no formal requirement for the development of new roads or the expansion of the exiting network.*"
Para. 36, page 21, Policy E2, The Economy.	"How would a viable economic use protect a designated heritage asset? How will an applicant demonstrate that a development contributes to a prosperous rural economy? How will this apply to householder development (e.g. an extension to an existing home)?"	A designated heritage asset may incur costs falling to the owner in order to ensure its sound upkeep, thus the owner may seek to develop an economic use to defray those costs of upkeep. Whether the proposed economic use is acceptable in relation to the heritage asset would be assessed and determined by the planning process, but the essential point of Policy E2 is whether the proposed economic use facilitates protection of the heritage asset. In respect of development and the area's rural economy, Policy E2 supports development of a scale that contributes to the prosperity of the rural economy and this over-arching principle in Policy E2 is clear to any advocate of development. How the developer demonstrates compliance rests with the developer, and planning	No additional clarification required.

		consent or refusal will rest with the strength of the developer's evidence. This is a normal procedural process in any planning application and so requires no additional specification in the Plan. If the development arises as a result of a householder developing an existing home, a similar process will apply.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 36, page 21, Policy E3, The Economy.	"What is this policy trying to achieve? Does this relate to new farming development or development on existing farms/agricultural enter - prises? How do you define 'an appropriate scale'?"	Development can originate from existing or new farming/agricultural enterprises, and Policy E3 allows for this fact. If a farming development arises which requires planning consent, then it is clear that Policy E3 and thus the Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals for sustainable farming i.e. farming which respects the long-term as well as the immediate social, economic and environmental interests of the area and its community, and where vice versa the NP will not render its support. In the case of 'appropriate scale', the present size, nature and character of the Plan area's rural nature will form a natural yardstick. Hence, given this natural contextual yardstick, no further specification in the Plan's policy is required.	No additional clarification required.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 36, page 21, Policy E4, The Economy.	"What are the existing community facilities (e.g. a map)? How do you define 'an appropriate scale'? How will an application demonstrate that a community use is not viable?"	Existing community facilities within the Plan area are limited, but a list of current facilities is presently provided in the NP Para. 39 under 'Projects to Support the Plan'. The feeling is that it would likely add little value to the NP to map these existing facilities within the Plan, but we will make a reference to their listing in NP para. 39 in the text of NP E4, and explore an external mapping of them for the NP using the methodology as	Policy E4 will be clarified in its first sentence to read: "Proposals for community facilities that are of an appropriate scale will be supported*; examples of existing community facilities are given in paragraph 39 of the Neighbourhood Plan.*"

		earlier described. It is to be noted that we have now included (see earlier above) the geographic location (postcodes) of the rugby, cricket and golf facilities in NP Para. 13. Once again, 'appropriate scale' depends on the context of the development proposal, and so appropriateness can only be determined on a case by case basis. In respect of how a community facility demonstrates that it is not viable any longer, that proof once again depends on the nature of the facility and the financial circumstances of the provider of that facility and so also has to be assessed on a case by case basis. Additional specification is not thought to be practical and so not necessary.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 37, page 22, Policy H1, Housing.	"How does this policy add to anything that is already set out in Wiltshire Core Strategy (CP2) and North Wiltshire Local Plan (H4)? Should there be a further sentence which makes it clear that the following criteria are the exceptions and evidence is required? If there was a child of a farmer who didn't want to work in farming, but wanted to remain in the area, how would the plan policies help them?"	It is accurate to observe that NP Policy H1 has a strong degree of commonality with WC CP2 and N. Wiltshire Local Plan H4, and NP Policy H1 also exists within the context of the Chippenham Sites Allocation Plan which affirms the A350 as a defining development boundary for the western side of Chippenham, i.e. supports the Chippenham Without NP's principle of being a rural area which is outside of Chippenham's own development compass. As NP H1 operates within the context of CP2, we need to clarify this within the NP title heading for 'Policy CWoNP – H1 (CP44, 48,50,52) to include CP2. CP2 affirms the need for new development to respect the existing character and form of the settlements (i.e. Allington, Sheldon, Lanhill), and that new development will not elongate the existing settlements nor impose on sensitive landscape, nor that development should result in coalescence of these settlements.	The text of Para 37 Policy H1 d/. will be clarified to read: "Development proposals for new dwellings must be supported by evidence of genuine need : [. . .] d/. Whereby housing is needed to support *members of families already in the plan area* to remain within the community." The heading of Policy CWoNP – H1 will be clarified to read: "*Policy CWoNP – H1 (CP2, 44,48,50,52).*"

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
		These features of CP2 are all fundamental features of the NP, although not repeated in NP H1 as this would, as observed, be to duplicate. Where NP Policy H1 is distinctive in its own right is in that, whilst recognising and operating within this foregoing reality, it also states specifically that new development in the NP area must be supported by evidence of genuine need, focused on exceptional sites for rural affordable housing, on agricultural workers housing, on where there is a need to maintain a heritage asset, or in order to support members of families already in the plan area to remain in the community. In the context of NWLP (2011) H4 - which asserts the need for new development in the open countryside to either be linked to the essential needs of agriculture or to replace an existing dwelling where its current residential use has not been abandoned but is incapable of retention in its current state or is to be replaced by a dwelling of similar size and scale – NP H1, as detailed above, does also usefully add to policy NWLP H4 governing development policy for new dwellings in the NP area. However where it is agreed that it is necessary to additionally clarify NP H1 is in the matter of a child of a farmer who doesn't want to work in farming, but wants to remain in the area, and thus how would the NP policies help them. Therefore we will clarify NP Policy H1 to cover not just older people but also members of families already in the plan area who want to remain in the plan area. The reality is that this policy is already in operation in the plan area. For example, family members from Allington Bar Farm have built a new dwelling, Henley House, alongside Allington Bar Farm to enable younger members of the family to continue to live in the plan area.	

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 37, page 22, Policy H2, Housing	"How do you propose to judge 'an improvement to the quality of the built environment'?"	Improvement can take many forms and the NP cannot and should not to attempt to catalogue these. However H2 makes this a requirement of replacement dwellings, and so the developer/ applicant must demonstrate in the application how this will be accomplished. Thus the ultimate decision on whether the application meets H2 will be based on the evidence submitted by the applicant/developer e.g. recent planning application and decision regarding Starveal Farm within the NP area.	No clarification is required.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 37, page 22, Policy H3, Housing	"What sort of adaptations are you expecting an applicant to show?"	It is agreed that it is difficult to be prescriptive in terms of requiring a new dwelling to demonstrate how it can be adapted to meet changing needs over time because, by definition, this requires knowing exactly what those changing needs will be and over what time period. Therefore this NP policy will be clarified to state that new dwellings will be supported in particular where they can demonstrate how they may be adapted to meet changing needs over time i.e. they will be favoured. The criteria likely to be used would be that they would be capable of improved energy efficiency, i.e. their construction did not limit such upgrading, and that the materials used in construction would allow the dwelling to be capable of adaption and conversion without major rebuilding.	The text of Para 37 Policy H3 will be clarified to read: "Proposals for new dwellings *will be supported in particular where they can demonstrate how they may* be adapted to meet changing needs over time."

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
Para. 38, page 23, Activities and projects to support the plan.	"This section lists the current community facilities and explains that the neighbourhood area does not have a parish / community hall. I suggest this is cross referenced / referred to in policy E4. If you want to promote / support the development of a community hall, why not include a specific policy for this in the plan?	The first observation about cross referencing community facilities in NP para.39 with NP Policy E4 has been made – see earlier clarification to NP text. Should there be a specific policy for a community hall? Earlier replies to the questionnaires showed considerable ambivalence on this question. Whilst advocacy was strong by some, others pointed out the very substantial cost of such a project, the small size of the population in the parish and thus the limited ability to subsequently service and utilise the facility effectively. For this set of reasons it was decided not to include the creation of a community hall as Policy in the Plan, but rather to simply refer to such its possibility as a future project for the Plan whose feasibility would be assessed by the Parish Council and the establishment of a Working Group if the Parish Council wished to pursue the project.	No additional clarification required, with note taken of an earlier clarification in the text of Policy E4.
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Para. 40, page 24, Plan Management.	"This section of the plan is welcomed. No specific comments to make at this stage."	Noted.	
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Appendices and annexes, page 26 ff.	"You do not need to copy and paste the policies – a list of relevant policies and a link to the relevant document	We appreciate this advice, however the Steering Group do believe that where it is practical to inform the Neighbourhood Plan with key texts behind the Plan, this is of valuable assistance to users of the Plan who can	**Core Policy 50 [excluding CP 50 text on Natura 2002 sites of which there are none in the NP area]** *to be included in Appendices*

	would be sufficient. If you decide to replicate policies (not advised), you should be aware that the reproduction of 'Core Policy 52: Landscape' is not correct (paras 1 and 2 need to re-join and read as a continuous paragraph)."	thus see significant aspects of policy base all in one document. Hence WC Core Policies (*not* their full supporting explanatory text) are cited, and please note that WC CP 50 – not currently included in the NP – will be included in a similar format as CP 50 forms the basis of an important clarification requested and supplied regarding the difference between NP HE1 and HE2 and also is key background policy to NP Policies NE1 and NE2. We also note: 1. Title of Appendices and Annexes in NP page 26 has an incorrect spelling of Appendices. To be corrected. 2. WC Core 'Policy 52': Landscape, cited in the WC observation, is correctly 'Policy 51': Landscape and is correctly documented in the NP except for the mistaken line spacing in the first paragraph (WC observation). This will be corrected.	*and Annexes, NP page 26 ff.* **Biodiversity and geodiversity** **Protection.** Development proposals must demonstrate how they protect features of nature conservation and geological value as part of the design rationale. There is an expectation that such features shall be retained, buffered, and managed favourably in order to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. Where it has been demonstrated that such features cannot be retained, removal or damage shall only be acceptable in circumstances where the anticipated ecological impacts have been mitigated as far as possible and appropriate compensatory measures can be secured to ensure no net loss of the local biodiversity resource, and secure the integrity of local ecological networks and provision of ecosystem services. All development proposals shall incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and reduce disturbance of sensitive wildlife species and

			habitats throughout the lifetime of the development. **Biodiversity enhancement** All development should seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Major development in particular must include measures to deliver biodiversity gains through opportunities to restore, enhance and create valuable habitats, ecological networks and ecosystem services. Such enhancement measures will contribute to the objectives and targets of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) or River Basin/Catchment Management Plan, particularly through landscape scale projects, and be relevant to the local landscape character. **Local sites** Sustainable development will avoid direct and indirect impacts upon local sites through sensitive site location and layout, and by maintaining sufficient buffers and ecological connectivity with the wider environment. Damage or disturbance to local sites will generally be unacceptable, other than in exceptional circumstances

NP Page/Para. ref.	WC Observation	NP Steering Group Observation	NP text clarification
			where it has been demonstrated that such impacts: i. cannot reasonably be avoided ii. are reduced as far as possible iii. are outweighed by other planning considerations in the public interest iv. where appropriate compensation measures can be secured through planning obligations or agreements. Development proposals affecting local sites must make a reasonable contribution to their favourable management in the long-term. * * * * Clarification in NP text of first paragraph of WC Core Policy 51: landscape to correctly read: "**Core Policy 51 - Landscape** *Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character, while any negative impacts must be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design and landscape measures.*

			Proposals should be informed by and sympathetic to the distinctive character areas identified in the relevant Landscape Character Assessment(s) and any other relevant assessments and studies. In particular, proposals will need to demonstrate that the following aspects of landscape character have been conserved and where possible enhanced through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures: [. . . .]
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Listed Buildings in Chippenham Without Parish – Wiltshire, NP pages 36 and 37.	"The table/list of listed buildings is comprehensive, but a graphic representation (i.e. a map of heritage assets) in the main body of the draft plan would be useful. Other key-non designated heritage features in the locality could also be referenced in the text, in addition to scheduled farmstead remains."	As earlier advised in this response in an item dealing with the NP Vision and an associated WC observation in that regard, we do not consider a detailed map to be practical for a number of reasons, although external mapping options for the NP document will be explored as earlier described. At the present time, we are clarifying the listing of Listed buildings to include their individual postcodes so physical location will be readily identifiable by online maps and we are also including in this listing the three scheduled historic monuments in the parish which are not presently recorded in the NP list. The online references provided for these scheduled historic monuments are accompanied by maps within those references. We do not propose to include non-	Clarification of Para 11 to refer to *Annex O*, not K. Clarification of Annex O to read: 'Heritage- List of *Scheduled Historic Monuments and* Listed Buildings'. Clarification of each listed building in Annex O to read [for example] : '1. Grade II: Allington House Chippenham Without, Wiltshire *SN14 6LN.*' Clarification of Annex O to include the Scheduled Historic Monuments, as follows:

		designated heritage assets in this list as this would likely cause confusion, and any selection process would be somewhat arbitrary.	*Lanhill Long Barrow, Scheduled Historic Monument, see details at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1010908* *Allington Romano-British Farmstead, Scheduled Historic Monument, see: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1425267* *Sheldon Medieval Settlement, Scheduled Historic Monument, see: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1018428*
NP Page/Para. ref.	**WC Observation**	**NP Steering Group Observation**	**NP text clarification**
Appendix 2, NP page 38, Community Engagement Process.	"Encouraging early community engagement is commendable but there is a danger that this approach conflicts with Wiltshire Council's pre-application enquiry protocol and community engagement strategy. I suggest discussing this with the Council in more detail following the consultation."	Clearly we would not wish to conflict with any pre-application advice or procedure operated by Wiltshire Council, so we will include a clarification in this appendix, Early Engagement section, to inform potential planning applicants of the Wiltshire Council service. We welcome the offer of further discussion from Wiltshire Council on how best to operate this pre-application advice service. If necessary, further advice on this matter can be posted on the Parish Council website. Note: Appendix 2 is now NP page 40.	Clarification of Appendix 2 text on Early Engagement to read: "It has been shown that making contact with the relevant stakeholders at the earliest of opportunities is key to the success of any project. Speaking to the Parish Council in the first instance will ensure the applicant is quickly put in touch with those who can advise on the Neighbourhood Plan. This initial contact with Chippenham Without Parish Council should be made through the Clerk at: clerk@chippenhamwithoutparishcouncil.gov.uk *and further essential advice*

			is provided by Wiltshire Council at: https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/2350/Pre-application-further-advice.”