



## **DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Planning Meeting held remotely on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021**

**Present:** Councillors: Day (GD – Chairman), Botham (MB – Vice Chairman), Hill (TH), Kemp (MK), Cowen (LC), Creasey (GC), Hollyman (MH), Stevens (DS) and Rotherham (PR)

**Clerk to the Council:** Lunn (BL)

**Councilor for Urchfont & The Cannings:** Whitehead (PW)

**Members of the Public (for all or part of the remote meeting):** Mr. S Veitch, Mr. B Naylor, Mrs M Whitehead

- 1. Apologies:** Cllr Cottle (SC)
- 2. Declarations of Interest** – None declared at the meeting
- 3. Minutes of a meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Seconder</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>To approve and sign the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>MH</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

- 4. Matters arising from Minutes of 13<sup>th</sup> January 2021** – None reported

### **5. Plans for discussion**

It was noted that no formal site visits were made in relation to the following applications due to COVID-19 restrictions. Decisions are, therefore, based largely on examination of the submitted plans. Some councillors did, however, view proposed works where possible from outside of property boundaries (TH had viewed all sites where possible).

It was also noted that no letters of representation have been received or appear on the WC website in respect of any of the applications being considered below.

GD asked why only UPC is shown as the only consultee on all of these applications, he wondered if the absence of letters of representation could be because neighbouring properties are not being notified of applications? PW confirmed that WC has an obligation to formally consult with UPC, neighbouring properties are still advised that an application has been submitted so that they can comment if they so wish.

#### **5a. 21/00662/TCA – Fell - Aspen at Breach House, Cuckoo Corner, Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 4RA for Mr. & Mrs Milanés**

TH reported that this is a fairly healthy looking tree but is right on the boundary with and overhangs Cuckoo Farmyard, it has been the subject of comment from neighbours. No other comments were made.

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Seconder</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>MK</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

#### **5b. 21/00666/TCA - Mulberry Tree 0 Reduce by 10 - 15% to previous cuts, Cotoneaster – Fell at Mulberry House, High Street, Urchfont, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 4QP for Mrs Harding**

TH noted that this mulberry tree has been the subject of regular maintenance applications in the past, it overhangs the church path. He had no objections on this basis. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5c. 20/11558/FUL - Proposed demolition & reconstruction of side extension to form ground floor dining area & enlarged 1st floor bedroom, conversion of garage to play room & extending side wall to form larger 1st floor bedroom & new study to rear of property, plus proposed garden workroom at 5 Manor Close, Urchfont, SN10 4RE for Mr. Acton**

TH noted that this site was visited in respect of the earlier extension application. However, some alarm was expressed by neighbours when the whole property was demolished due to the fact that walls were not considered safe. The WC Enforcement Officer visited the site and advised the applicant that a new application had to be made covering the demolition and proposed extension of the original footprint – hence this current application. Despite the new application stating that works had not commenced, TH noted that re-building works had actually commenced with walls up to around 6 or 7 feet this week. Some very minor changes are indicated on the new plans, but these tend to improve similarity to neighbouring properties. GD agreed, he had studied the plans and felt that there are only minor differences to the original proposals, on balance he considered these to be fine. LC expressed some concern that the planning system might have been ignored by demolishing without prior approval and by re-starting works prior to approval of this new application. PW commented that this application should only reinstate the footprint and structure of the original building plus approved changes which were the subject of the earlier application. If proposed changes are only considered minor then this is probably OK, but if this is not the case now or subsequently identified during the reconstruction then UPC should highlight this to WC Planning Enforcement. LC suggested that the UPC comment should be NO OBJECTION rather than SUPPORT, but others did not agree.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
<b>To SUPPORT this application subject to the property being rebuilt to the original footprint and structure plus changes approved in application 20/01251/FUL</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5d. 20/11533/FUL- Part retrospective application for the creation a new agricultural track at Manor Farm, Conock, SN10 3QQ for Mr. Hues**

TH explained that this application refers to a site which abuts the boundary with Urchfont Parish, it is not within it. Apparently the surface of the current track was hardened by WC Highways in compensation for the applicant allowing use of his land whilst road works were being undertaken on the A342. However, it is understood that this retrospective application has been necessitated as a result of complaints to the WC Enforcement Officer. TH did not see any issues with the application. MH agreed. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>LC</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5e. 21/00644/TCA - Sycamore (T1) – multi-stemmed tree on bank. Fell due to excessive shading to 17 Manor Farmyard and Bluebell cottage at 17 Manor Farmyard, Urchfont, SN10 4BA for Mr. White**

TH commented that this tree actually overhangs Bluebell Cottage in Friars Lane and has been the subject of earlier discussion with WC regarding ownership because it is sited in the bank below Manor farmyard. No action was taken at that time, but remains a concern from Bluebell Cottage. TH could see no objections to the proposal. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>MK</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5f. 21/00692/TCA - Beech (T1) - 30% crown reduction, Whitebeam (T2) - fell as growing into crown of adjacent beech, Group of beech (T3) - reduce by 30 - 40%, Birch (T4) - reduce by 30 - 40% to match T3 group of beech at Fiddlers Cottage, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RB for Mr. Church**

TH explained that this application mainly related to tree maintenance work. The Whitebeam to be felled is close to the boundary with the footpath to the school and appears to be in poor condition. TH saw no issues with this application. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>LC</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5g. 21/00922/TCA - Norway spruce (T1) - fell due to excessive shading of small garden and interference with phone lines, Holly (T2 & T3) – fell, Yew (T4) - reduce crown by 30% at Toms, The Green, Urchfont, SN10 4RA for Mr. Boxshall**

TH confirmed that the spruce is indeed interfering with telephone cables, the holly trees were probably self-seeded. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>MK</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5h. 20/07880/FUL - Conservatory to rear elevation at Lime Tree Cottage, Manor Close, Urchfont, SN10 4RE for Mr. Baker**

TH commented that, whilst the proposed conservatory site could not be seen from the road, the relatively small size is quite clear from the submitted plans. As such TH was surprised that this work could not have been undertaken as a permitted development. GD hoped that neighbours had been consulted prior to the application being submitted, if they had then no letters of representation have been submitted to date. No other comments were made.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
<b>To SUPPORT this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>DS</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**5i. 21/01083/TPO - Smooth Japanese Maple (T7) – Fell, Beech 'Asplenifolia' (T8) - reduce crown by 25%, Birch (T1) - crown clean, Sycamore (T2) - reduce crown on eastern side over neighbouring property to balance. Crown clean, Wild cherry (T4) - crown clean, thin crown, remove stubs from previous work and remove lower damaged limb which extends north towards dwelling at Jubilee House, Townsend, Urchfont, SN10 4RR for Mr. Stephens**

Whilst UPC do not normally agree to TPO applications, TH had viewed the proposals and spoken to the applicant at a distance. The proposed tree to be felled, a Japanese Maple, looks in poor condition and is overshadowed by other trees. The applicant believed that approval to fell had actually been given at some time in the past prior to the building of his house, but no action had been taken at that time.

Proposal	Proposer	Secunder	Resolution
<b>NO OBJECTION to this application</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>MH</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

## **6. Decisions received from Wiltshire Council up to 29th January 2021**

**6a. 20/11562/TCA – Rear Garden – Beech Tree – reduce crown by 30% & shape accordingly and raise crown over neighbouring property by up to 2.5m at Laurel House, Urchfont, SN10 4QY – NO OBJECTION**

## **7. Matters for Report**

**a. Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review Consultation –** TH referred to his report which appears at Appendix 1 of these minutes (on the website only) and sought any comments. MH asked what the term rural actually means? TH confirmed that Urchfont is deemed to be a large village under WC definitions within the Plan. PW confirmed that WC had identified major settlement areas where development will be required over the next 20 years. However, to ensure that all development opportunities are considered even in very small hamlets such as Wedhampton, some definitions have been

changed. TH said that the Plan suggests a matrix for the number of houses to be built in a large village such as Urchfont, but a housing needs survey will be necessary to substantiate this. PW stated that significant building sites have been identified across Wiltshire, many of which are long term aspirations or maybe's which by experience will fall by the wayside over time. PW suggested that UPC should not be concerned that WC intend to approve large developments, this will not be the case because targets are already being met.

TH confirmed that he and GD had attended a virtual presentation on the Plan on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2021 and had asked for a definition of 'affordable housing', a response is still awaited. PW stated that affordable is defined as between 80-85% of the market property value as opposed to social housing being 60%.

TH then referred to his draft responses to the 'Empowering Rural Communities' of the Wiltshire Local Plan (see Appendix 2 to these minutes – on the website only) and asked for comments. MK felt the draft answers were good, especially about the work involved in producing neighbourhood plans and the need for a template. LC was particularly impressed about the comments on property extensions and the fact that financially this might put them out of reach of some purchasers. TH commented that he believed WC had included some good ideas and suggestions in their Plan. GD commented that the virtual meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> February had been very professionally run and very informative. PW said that his appointment of Sam Fox as WC Head of Planning will bring very positive benefits, he was pleased to note the comments about the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> February and will pass these back to Sam.

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Secunder</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>To approve the format, substance and wording of the proposed response to the consultation, subject to the public being given an opportunity to comment prior to the deadline for submission. UPC to consider any public comments received and amend answers where appropriate before submission.</b>	<b>TH</b>	<b>GD</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

In addition to attaching the consultation response as an appendix to these minutes, It was agreed that BL will highlight the call for public comments in a 'Latest News' article on the website Home page with a deadline for responses to TH of 28<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

**ACTION: Planning/03/20 – BL**

**Date of next scheduled Planning Meeting is Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021.**

**Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review Consultation.**

Wiltshire Council is currently reviewing its 'Wiltshire Core Strategy' (the current WC planning document) in order to replace it with a new plan, the 'Wiltshire Local Plan', which will cover the period from 2016 to 2036. As part of the review WC seeks views from Town and Parish communities on its current policies and future proposals through consultation. The consultation started on the 13<sup>th</sup> January and continues until 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021. WC hopes to complete the overall review by the end of 2021.

Since 13<sup>th</sup> January, WC Planning Officers have been conducting a number of virtual meetings to explain the consultation process. The Chairman and I logged onto one of these virtual meetings on 1<sup>st</sup> February, which was particularly aimed at rural communities.

This report is intended to provide councillors and parishioners with a brief summary of what WC expects from local rural communities, and some of the key points on how the Local Plan will impact upon those communities. To view all documents associated with the review and the consultation process, interested parties should visit;

[www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-policy-local-plan-review-consultation](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-policy-local-plan-review-consultation)

For the purposes of the review Urchfont is classed as a Large Village and is referred to within the 'Empowering Rural Communities' document.

Wiltshire is divided up into Housing Market Areas (HMA) and Urchfont Parish falls within the Chippenham HMA. The expected total number of houses to be built in the Chippenham HMA (within Large Villages) is 1,435 (2016 to 2036). The allocation for Urchfont is 65. However, it identifies 60 dwellings have either already been built, or are committed to be built, within our area and therefore it would appear that our shortfall of new dwellings currently stands at 5 (assuming all sites within our NP are developed).

Our 'made' Neighbourhood Plan will continue to be valid within the Local Plan but parts of it, e.g. Housing Needs, will need to be updated. We will also need to ensure our existing NP meets the new Local Plan policies.

WC propose a number of changes around meeting local needs such as affordable houses whilst preventing sporadic development outside of designated settlements. NP's are seen as the main vehicle for achieving this.

WC encourages the use of Housing Needs Analysis to identify the actual number of new dwellings (by number and type) required by our community.

The WC review is based upon the current NPPF, which may alter if the Governments White Paper on Planning for the future is enacted.

**CLlr Trevor Hill (Lead of Planning)**

**Wiltshire Local Plan Consultation**

**Empowering Rural Communities questions and answers approved by UPC at their meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021.**

(Please note that the preamble to all questions is a direct lift from the 'Empowering Rural Communities' document to assist the reader to better understand the answers identified **in red italics**.)

**Assessing local housing need**

11. To understand local housing needs, individual communities are encouraged to carry out a Rural Housing Needs Survey to assess their needs for affordable housing. Questionnaire design and analysis can be carried out by the Council, while the local community administer the survey. A standard approach, with the flexibility to include bespoke local questions, allows trends to be detected and comparisons with other parts of Wiltshire.
12. An assessment of local housing needs is central to determining what scale of housing should be planned for over the plan period and the types of new homes that may be needed.
13. Currently, surveys can take some considerable time and resource to undertake. The process can be improved and speeded up by quickening the shift from paper to online responses. Online evidence gathering provides scope for a quicker turnaround of analysis and less delay. Communities would be relieved of some of the burden involved and able to concentrate on progressing their plans.
14. The focus of evidence gathering may also extend to other areas of interest to the community. As well as affordable housing the Council will extend needs assessment to include market sectors such as homes for the elderly, entry level homes, key workers, sheltered accommodation or smaller dwellings.

**Meeting Local Needs**

15. The Council is proposing several means to simplify the planning process and better help local communities looking to meet local needs.
16. There are a number of potentially confusing means by which a community can deliver the homes it seeks. As well as the conventional market these can include Community Land Trusts (CLTs), Co-housing, Housing Co-operatives, Self and Custom Build, Self-help housing, and Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs), amongst others. Planning terms like affordable housing, its different forms, community led housing and exception sites can also be part of the complexity.

**Market housing**

17. The Council prefers sites for market housing to be identified by communities themselves through neighbourhood planning. These sites will be generally at Local Service Centres and at Large Villages. A proportion of the dwellings will be affordable homes. At present the amount varies. 40% of homes can be sought in some cases and 30% in others, some parts of the County affordable homes can only be sought through schemes of more than ten dwellings in others five.
18. In the rural area, the Council intends to simplify the situation by seeking 40% on all schemes of more than five dwellings where possible<sup>6</sup>. To help support neighbourhood planning work the Council is preparing guidance on how to select the most appropriate sites for development and how to frame plan proposals to help ensure the community obtain the development it envisages.

## Question 1

***Do you agree there should be a target of 40% affordable homes on all new schemes of more than five dwellings in the rural area? What other approaches might there be?***

**Answer approved by UPC 10th February 2021;**

***We support the proposal of a target of 40% affordable homes on all new schemes of more than five dwellings in the rural area.***

***We are still awaiting, but welcome the promised response from Wiltshire Council regarding a precise definition of 'affordable'.***

***The provision of affordable housing stock within villages, large and small, is important but equally so is the provision and retention of smaller lower market value properties, i.e. under £250k.***

***The majority of building schemes within large and small villages tend to be for 5 or less dwellings and therefore these sites avoid providing any affordable or any lower market value homes. Where these schemes are within a development boundary, which already has a predominance of smaller size (2/3 bed) or type (semi, bungalow) homes, any new build should reflect the characteristics and size of the existing dwellings to retain and respect the character and setting of that area.***

***Housing needs surveys could be used to identify these areas.***

### **Community led housing and affordable homes**

19. Most communities do not imagine local housing needs solely in terms of affordable homes. Communities may wish to respond to needs identified for sheltered accommodation, first homes or possibly key workers. The distinction in planning terms between affordable and market housing can sometimes be an obstacle.
20. The Council proposes to have just one policy and therefore one point of reference for assessing planning proposals to meet local housing needs at rural settlements (including Small Villages, Large Villages and Local Service Centres). This will allow for both affordable housing and community led initiatives; the latter of which might include market dwellings, community buildings or other uses.
21. It is proposed to amend the current Core Policy 44 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as set out on the following page. The wording has been amended to focus on and clarify the essential requirements. It results from discussions with Parish Councils and other stakeholders. Views and comments are now invited more widely as part of this consultation.
22. The Council, in partnership with others, would also prepare guidance to illustrate how the policy requirements would be met by evidence and material either in support of a planning application or plan allocation.

### **Community needs and dwelling size**

23. The vitality of rural communities, like any other, relies on a variety of households of differing sizes and ages. Communities with a better mix provide greater resilience. They can provide informal support networks or by having a range of different needs, be it for schools, bus services or medical care, the future prospects for these services and facilities are improved.
24. There is a tendency for dwelling occupants to extend their homes and for replacement dwellings to be larger, in terms of number of bedrooms, than the homes they are replacing. Over time a village can lose the range of dwellings sizes that help to maintain a good social mix. It is difficult, once lost, to replace a supply of smaller dwellings and doing so may also involve building into the countryside.
25. It may be in the wider public interest to prevent such change continuing. The Council is considering ways in which this can be achieved by planning controls. Permitted development rights (automatic permission for house extensions) might be withdrawn on new small homes. Set against this, permitted development rights are enshrined in law and a compelling case is needed to withdraw them. The Council, however, is inviting views on whether it is right to identify this as an issue to address and if so by what means.

## Question 2

*2(a) Do you think this approach is worth pursuing?*

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

*The loss of smaller dwelling (2/3 bedroom dwellings) stock through property extensions is an ever-present problem within large and small villages. Any effort to secure new affordable/lower market value properties is continually being undermined by the loss of current stocks through site development. Permitted development rights certainly encourage building extensions and in turn add to the problem.*

*To counter the general tendency for housing stock to be expanded, an overarching view of neighbourhood characteristics should be enforced on new developments to ensure that the pool of starter/affordable homes is not reduced.*

*2(b) What local evidence would be needed to justify applying restrictions like these?*

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

*Through local Housing Needs Surveys each large and small village should identify those areas/individual streets/close or even individual properties, where any building expansion development is considered inappropriate in order to retain its pool of starter/lower value dwelling stock. These areas, properties etc. could be given a 'not for development' classification within the NP.*

*Local councils could use the Neighbourhood Plan classification to argue against any unreasonable planning applications.*

### **Revised Core Policy 44**

#### **Rural Exceptions Sites and Community Led Housing**

##### **Rural exceptions sites**

At rural settlements, development proposals will be supported where their primary purpose is to provide affordable housing to meet local needs, provided:

- i. It has clear support from the local community through evidenced consultation.
- ii. The number, type, size and tenure of the affordable dwellings should reflect identified and genuine local needs as evidenced on the Homes4Wiltshire register and/or through a local housing needs survey
- iii. The proposal is within, adjoining or well related to the existing settlement without reliance on travel by private car
- iv. Environmental and landscape considerations will not be compromised
- v. The proposal consists of 20 dwellings or fewer and will be no greater than 5% of the size of the settlement
- vi. Its scale and type is appropriate to the nature of the settlement and will respect the character and setting of that settlement
- vii. The affordable housing provided will always be available for defined local needs, both initially and on subsequent change of occupant.

Proposals which include plots for self and custom build affordable homes will be supported where they meet the above criteria.

##### **Cross-subsidy/Market Housing**

Rural exception sites must primarily be led by an affordable housing proposal. The inclusion of up to 25% open market housing will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that the site would be unviable as an exception site without cross-subsidy, and/or where it is proven essential to provide a balanced and sustainable community, with evidence of support from a Community Land Trust or other community representation.



For rural exceptions site and community led housing developments, the number, type and size of open market homes will reflect the proven needs, and will be integrated throughout the development so as to be indistinguishable from the affordable housing.

### **Community Led Housing**

At rural settlements, proposals brought forward by a Community Land Trust will be supported, provided Criteria (i) - (vii) above are complied with. The inclusion of up to 50% open market housing will be considered for this type of Community Led Housing, where it can be demonstrated that it would meet an identified local need.

The Council will secure nomination rights to the affordable homes in line with its adopted Allocations Policy.

### **Question 3**

***Do you agree with the approach set out in the suggested revised Core Policy 44? If not, why not? How could it be improved?***

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

***This suggested revised Core Policy 44 is supported, in particular paragraph vii (The affordable housing provided will always be available for defined local needs, both initially and on subsequent change of occupant)***

### **New Core Policy**

#### **Housing Requirements for Neighbourhood Area Designations in the Rural Area**

Meeting the needs of Local Service Centres and Large Villages Housing, housing requirements for neighbourhood area designations will be met by:

- Existing planning permissions and plan allocations that have not yet been implemented
- Small sites within settlement boundaries
- Exception and Community-led Schemes accordance with Core Policy 44
- Site allocations in the development plan

The general presumption against housing proposals outside a settlement will apply in accordance with Core Policy 2.

Site allocations will generally be made in neighbourhood plans. Where this is not the case, it may be necessary for the Council to allocate sites. This may be achieved by a review of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.

53. A proportion of housing requirements are already met by homes completed or in the pipeline in terms of having planning permission or allocations in the development plan. On going monitoring will need to consider whether these sites remain likely to be delivered within the plan period. For example, there may be obstacles to building on a plot of land that have only come to light since a plan was prepared.
54. Many additional homes in rural settlements have been built in small schemes, on infill plots and by the conversion of existing buildings. This will continue to be the case. Supply from this source has been quite consistent over the years but, by their nature as 'windfall' and because of their size, they are impossible to identify individually when preparing a plan. A proportion of the requirement, depending on local evidence such as past completions, will be met by these means and will not therefore need to be planned for by land allocation.
55. Once existing commitments and an allowance for small site completions have been deducted, communities may consider how they meet the remainder of the homes required. They should do so based on as good an understanding of local needs as possible. They are encouraged to carry out a local housing needs survey to inform their work.
56. An understanding of local housing needs will help to decide what should be pursued to meet local needs and may be accommodated as an exception to planning controls on greenfield land adjoining a settlements, usually as a community-led project and what should be identified as open market homes that might include an element of affordable dwellings.

57. What course to follow, and sometime in what balance, will vary from place to place depending upon local need, but also such other matters as what land is available and well-located for the purpose, as well as an appetite to take on the task. This is a matter for local decision by local communities.
58. A new or review of an existing neighbourhood plan can be a good way forward. The Council supports communities' neighbourhood planning and will provide further guidance on site allocation and other aspects to help them prepare or review their plans.

#### **Question 4**

***What do you think to the housing requirements for Local Service Centres and Large Villages? Should requirements be higher or lower? If so which ones and why?***

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

***The matrix used to determine the housing figure for individual Local Service Centres and Large Villages seems logical and therefore the indicated levels appear appropriate.***

***Should local communities wish to raise or lower their individual allocation, this should be a matter for those local communities and could be achieved through evidenced housing needs analysis and reflected in their local Neighbourhood Plan.***

#### **Question 5**

***To comment on the housing figure that interest you, please state which area of the county the settlement falls within.***

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

***These answers are provided the Urchfont Parish Council, which represents the Parish of Urchfont, which includes Urchfont (Large) village and the smaller villages of Wedhampton and Lydeaway. All fall within the Chippenham HMA.***

#### **Question 6**

***If you have any further comments you wish to make, please detail them below.***

**Answer approved by UPC 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021;**

***Throughout this review considerable emphasis has been placed upon the importance of Neighbourhood Plans (NP). The preparation of NP's are very time consuming and labour intensive. There are still a number of Towns and Parish Councils that do not have a 'made' NP's and have either not started, or are only part way through, the process.***

***Wiltshire Council now has a good sample of NP's and all will vary in their composition. Has WC considered preparing a NP template for use by all councils? This would undoubtedly speed up the 'making' process and could incorporate the best elements of current plans.***