

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
Ref.No. 1.18.02	N/A	No specific comments. Refer to appendix to letter highlighting factors to be considered by communities when any developments are proposed		Noted with thanks
Ref.No. 2.20.02	N/A	Having considered the Plan I can confirm that there are no significant policy issues upon which we wish to comment. But we would like to take this opportunity to highlight how pleased we are to note how much your community values its distinctive historic environment and how this is reflected in the suite of policies covering such themes as the Conservation Area, Views and Heritage Assets. Our congratulations on the process to date and we wish your community well in the making of its Plan.		Noted with thanks
Ref.No. 3.20.02	N/A	Please can you advise whether you would require any services from us as per your attached plans. If you require any site visits or requests such as diversions of our equipment, protection of equipment or safety advice please do not hesitate to contact us and we will see how we can assist,		No response to the draft Plan
Ref. No. 4.20.02	sp8	In my opinion, a wealthy community such as Seend should have more forward-thinking policies towards community facilities. These should keep the community at heart and should force development in line with reduction in motorised transport and inclusivity of all generations. At the moment, the stance is that facilities can be removed, when they are no longer fit for purpose without the explicit expectation to extensively explore renewing/replacing before removal. On the other hand, to support the development of new or better facilities, applicants will have to demonstrate a need for proposed facilities or to show how the plans are mitigating the loss of existing facilities, which appears to be a passive and non-welcoming stance. In my opinion, this wording creates a bias towards preserving the status quo, rather than encouraging and engaging the community to explore modern and forward-thinking plans which will improve the overall living standards of the community.	Community facilities should – periodically – be critically reviewed and renewed in line with any development within the community based on the following questions: 1. Are we taking steps to increase the number of accessible community facilities along with a growing community?*	Policy amended to be more positively worded
	SP13	Encouraging" and "supporting" sustainable development is, in my opinion, not strong enough. This community is wealthy enough to make a stance for the environment by saying that development must be sustainable and hence make it mandatory for any developer to show that the following positive changes towards local nature and global climate change are met.	A requirement for: Clear and demonstrable reduction in reliance on motorised transport for the purposes of education, entertainment, grocery shopping and other services such as (but not exclusive to) post and banking. 1.Inclusion of alternative energy sources (wind, solar, ground source, thermodynamics....) 2.A clear counter-balance to the reduction of natural habitat through development, by creating niches for local wildlife, by planting hedges, trees or creating small wildlife sanctuaries such as ponds or similar.	SP13 Climate Change and Sustainable Design has been updated
Ref.No. 5.02.03		National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.		Noted with thanks

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
Ref.No. 6.04.03	Page 19 Policies SP4, SP5 and SP7	<p>The Seend NDP should be designed to provide a development framework of strategic and non-strategic development policies which will allow sound planning decisions to be made on future development. The plan covers the 10-year period to 2030.</p> <p>One of the purposes of a sound neighbourhood plan is to contribute to community resilience by taking account of future unwanted development threats a community may face. The made plan should identify such threats and make sound proposals for eliminating or mitigating them. The plan should serve, as far as is possible, to future-proof the designated area by providing sensible policies that address these issues whilst promoting development where it is considered appropriate to meet defined local and strategic needs.</p> <p>Understandably, because of late breaking developments, none of the policies in the plan have yet considered the threat to the parish from the ongoing work of the Western Gateway Sub-National Transport Body (WGSTB) <a href="https://westergatewaysbtb.org.uk">https://westergatewaysbtb.org.uk</a>. The work of this body is highly likely to have a significant and adverse impact on the parish of Seend within the lifetime of the Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan. See page 184 of Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body Regional Evidence Base &amp; MRN / LLM Scheme Priorities – July 2019.</p> <p>A thorough reading of the available material concerning the route of the Eastern Melksham By-Pass, commonly referred to in context as Melksham A350 Route Option C, will show that there is a high likelihood that the route Option C will in fact be chosen for construction. Government funding has been awarded for the development of this £1.35m proposal. The fact that route Option C is favoured is also being reported in local and regional media. In their exhibition boards the WGSTB literature quotes an estimated construction date of 2023/24. Although there may be a delay to the start of the project, the likelihood and imminence of this major project actually going ahead is a matter for consideration in the Seend plan.</p>	<p><i>Formulate statements within SP 4, 5 and 7 that will restrict development of parish agricultural and ex-railway land within parish boundaries and at least not within 100m of the canal.</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of these polices should be to ensure our parish does not develop an urban edge that will change the nature of the landscape in the valley and threaten the values of the canal corridor.</i></p>	<p>Policies SP4, 5 and 7 and supporting text have been revised to take account of the likely development of by-pass and to strengthen the policy intent but cannot be as restrictive as proposed. The distance of 100m would have no justification or evidence to implement.</p>

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
		<p>How will A350 Route Option C impact the Parish of Seend?</p> <p>Firstly, the current proposed route will involve land within parish boundaries, though these feedback comments offer no concerns over the proposed construction of the highway as such issues are outside the remit of neighbourhood plans as national infrastructure developments. These comments are more concerned with what happens as a result of the construction of the by-pass and are made with the neighbourhood plan Vision and Objectives statements, on pages 16 and 17 of the plan, in mind.</p> <p>The proximity of the proposed highway will have a range of social, environmental and economic impacts for Seend. Such impacts are self-evident and whilst there is no requirement to deal with them here, they will be particularly concerning for quality of life within Seend Cleeve and for the preservation of the landscape and rural nature of the parish of Seend and its ecology within the valued linear parkway of the K &amp; A Canal.</p> <p>The Bowerhill gap, through which the A350 by-pass will be routed is just 320m wide. At its narrowest, to the west of Chippenham, the dual A350 carriageway has a boundary to boundary width of 35m. Therefore, if the proposed eastern by-pass carriageway is centered in the Bowerhill gap, the boundary of the carriageway will be less than 145m from the Kennet and Avon Canal towpath. The likely route will also bisect the public footpaths SEEN13, and 17 and may impinge on SEEN18. The by-pass will also bisect the track of the disused railway line offering further opportunities for development in adjacent agricultural parish land. See the inset maps below. The route options map was taken from <a href="https://westerngatewaystb.org.uk">https://westerngatewaystb.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>Bowerhill residents will understandably see the centering of the by-pass route in the Bowerhill gap as inequitable on the basis that residences there will be closer to the carriageway with a centred alignment in the gap than those of Seend Cleeve. Seend may expect that the route of the by-pass might be closer to the canal for this reason. If this proves to be the case the impact on Giles Wood should also be considered within the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Amend the projects list at 7.1 on page 52 to:</p> <p>a) Extend Giles Wood to the east at depth, and/or</p> <p>b) Increase the towpath side hedgerow thickness to provide a 1.5km eastern shelter belt against noise and light and to improve the biodiversity of the corridor as an offset against that lost by the by-pass construction.</p>	<p>The Steering Group are keen to support any opportunity that arises to plant more trees, and this is stated on page 52 of the Plan, under Environmental Enhancement. The respondent's suggestion is in direct response to the proposed Melksham by-pass. The Steering Group has been advised that tree planting and other mitigation against the negative environmental impacts of the by-pass should be dealt with at the more detailed stage of work on the by-pass, when landscape and other relevant technical specialists can guide development appropriately.</p>
Ref.No. 7.05.20	Map 6	Land put forward for consideration for allocation in the Plan. See full comments and map.		Available sites were assessed as part of the process of preparing this plan and a decision made not to allocate. This may change when the Plan is reviewed. Landowner's contact details will be kept on SG's record for this purpose.
Ref.No. 8.11.03	page 41 para 7	Site assessment report 2019 statesd Website shows SAR January 2020 update dates to January 2020		Checked

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Page 59	<p>On website Site Assessment Report January 2020 – shows on page 23/24 for site 8 at Rew Farm, conclusion not suitable for development.</p> <p>Q1: Why on supporting evidence 'Appendix 1: Sites suitable for development Stage 2', shows this site as being 'Suitable' ?</p> <p>Q2: Plus who has determined c/ 5 houses and its location ?</p> <p>Q3: Please forward details of 'separate form' indicated on appendix 1 Stage 2 for this site.</p> <p>Q4: Objection to being allocated Stage 2.:            Previous planning applications for site have all been declined due to reasons shown in the Site Assessment January 2020 report and more. Please amend for allocating this site to Stage 1 'unacceptable' due to impact on the area/landscape sensitivity/highly visible/access/etc.,with elevation over road adding to visual intrusion.</p>		<p>Q1. Appendix 1 shows Site 8 Rew Farm as 'suitable for Stage 2' assessment. Sites identified as in an unsustainable location (outside of settlement boundary limits an/or detached from existing development) were dismissed from the process after Stage 1. Site 8 was assessed as on the edge of Seend Cleeve (designated small village) and so progressed to Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Q2. Wiltshire Council Highways Department carried out a high level commentary on the potential for Site 8 as a CLT site and suggested the c.5 dwellings figure.</p> <p>Q3. Details of 'separate form' were shared with respondent during Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>Q4. Results and process of site assessment are given in Site Assessment Report. See answer to Q1 above, which explains why Site 8 was progressed to Stage 2 of assessment. Site 8 was found unsuitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan overall.</p>
Ref.No. 9.12.03	5.1	<p>I was very pleased to see the picnic area noted as a green space requiring protection. The area is so well used by residents and the BRAG volunteers put in hundreds of hours unpaid work maintaining it and the adjoining footpath and bridle way. I would like to confirm that the area to be protected extends to the land either side of the footpath/bridleway and the hedgerow, as the land to the right of the footpath as you walk from Seend to Bowerhill has been set aside for memorial benches and tree planting. There are already 3 benches in place.</p> <p>I was surprised and a little disappointed to see that Giles Wood however has not been mentioned in the plan. This area most definitely in my opinion is worthy of protection.</p> <p>Seend Parish Council deserve a lot of credit for putting together the neighbourhood plan, it is an excellent document.</p>	Giles wood - how is this included...	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Boundary reviewed and considered to be correct</p> <p>Giles Wood is identified as woodland in the green infrastructure network, this informs the biodiversity and green infrastructure policy in the Plan.</p> <p>It is also now included as a Local Green Space designation.</p>
Ref.No. 10.13.03	General	Please note that the Kennet and Avon Canal uses an ampersand not and	please check throughout document and correct where necessary	Amended
	5.1	The Canal & River Trust welcome recognition of the unlisted heritage assets along the Canal.		Noted with thanks
	SP5	Canal & River Trust welcome recognition of the Canal as Green Infrastructure		Noted with thanks
		The Canal & River Trust welcome the inclusion of Policy SP5 and supporting text. See full comments. The Trust has produced a guide to help local communities who are writing Neighbourhood Plans... you may wish to reference this.		Noted with thanks
	Objective 8 & preapplication protocol	C&RT offer free pre application consultation service for development near to the canal. We would welcome mention of this, or at least a suggestion that developers should contact the Trust to discuss any proposed development affecting the canal.		Noted with thanks, and text amended to include this point.
	7.1 projects	C&RT welcome early discussions on any aspirations affecting our infrastructure or adjacent to the canal. This could include improving pedestrian access to the canal bridge and a new canal side open space.		Noted with thanks. Comment added into the projects section of the Plan.

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
Ref.No. 11.14.03	Local Green Space	Hello. I am the Secretary of Bowerhill Residents Action Group and we are very pleased that you have included our picnic area in your Neighbourhood Plan. However, after looking through the full draft plan we are surprised that we can find no mention of Giles Wood. So many people from both communities enjoy Giles Wood and are grateful to the Giles family over the years for looking after the wood and allowing people to roam the wood. It is a marvelous place for nature, and I personally go there daily with my dog who loves the freedom to play		Giles Wood is identified as woodland in the green infrastructure network, this informs the biodiversity and green infrastructure policy in the Plan.  Following Reg 14 feedback this space is now included as a Local Green Space.
Ref.No. 12.23.03	SP13	I would like the village to be more sustainable and to have more future proofing and environmental awareness.  We (As a village) could be looking at ways to use and harvest Green Energy within our homes, schools, clubs and community assets like pubs/shops and can this feature (in more depth) within our plan and our commitment to the future generations.	All businesses should have a sustainability plan in place and we can help and encourage this.  The parish should have a target to be carbon negative.	Noted but outside the remit of this Plan.  Seend Parish Council consider it a commendable aspiration that Wiltshire County Council are aiming to be Carbon Neutral by 2030 and support them with this endeavour. The Parish Council look to be guided by Wiltshire C.C. with the forthcoming Local Plan strengthening its approach to both sustainable development and climate change. In terms of the Parish it would not be in the remit of the P.C. to commit to a target of the Parish being Carbon Neutral at any point in the future as this would be impossible to calculate.
			All village events (Like the Fete / Beer festival, Pantos) should be managed in a consciously sustainable way.	Noted but outside the remit of this Plan.
	SP10	Design and build for the future. (Forward planning) Houses for the old/retired and not just starter homes. We talk about this with friends. Smaller community homes with shared veg patches, central within the village. I see value in building modern retirement homes (not a traditional block) but smaller pods, within a community setting. This would free up family homes within the village for younger families to move into whilst protecting the village against more commercial development. Seend has an opportunity to be a forward thinker and a leader		Policy SP10 addresses this point and supports community led housing
	SP1	Look at the design of new builds. So many lack character. There are technologies available to create new, exciting homes, the design of which, should consider longevity. Houses need to have appeal to those wanting to buy them. What facilities do you want? What care is in place? What are the needs of the owners. (Close to the village, the shops the infrastructure) Do they have electric hook up?		Policy SP1 and the Parish Character Statement aim to address this point.
Ref.No. 14.26.03		Letter form the Agency signposts bodies who can give guidance about sustainability. See full comments		Noted
Ref.No. 15.26.03	Page 24 Policy SP2	Policy SP2: Seend Conservation Area, states that any development within the conservation area must demonstrate that it had acknowledged the Seend Conservation Area Statement and the Seed Parish Character Statement. Wessex Water has existing apparatus passing through this conservation area. This policy must not constrain maintenance or improvement programmes, which are critical for the efficient and safe operation of Wessex Water services.		Noted. Efficient and safe operation of wessex water services is important, the application of this policy to any works requiring planning permission should take into account the high value character of the Conservation Area and respond appropriately.

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Page 34 Policy SP6	Policy SP6 proposes Green Space 8 "Dial Close" as a designated Local Green Space. Wessex Water has a 4 inch water main passing through this space. This policy must not constrain maintenance or improvement programmes, which are critical for the efficient and safe operation of Wessex Water services.		Local Green Spaces are designated to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to the community, to ensure they remain as such. It is acknowledged that maintenance and improvement programmes must take place. It is proposed the space be protected as open green space, which rules out development except in exceptional circumstances.
Ref.No. 16.27.03	para1.2; p5	Sets out that the document is to involve residents in decisions about how our village develops. However, there are no proposals in the plan setting out how and where this can be implemented. Whilst the Wiltshire plan does not currently identify housing need in the Melksham Community area, this may change considering the Local Plan review. In particular, without locating sites to be allocated for development, it is likely that developers will put forward any parcel of land for development which then will be potentially difficult to defend. We have already witnessed this with the objection by the Parish Council to the caravan and day room at Blossom Hill of Seend and then subsequent engineering works being carried out which were not part of the permission.	Recommend including a plan showing the currently available sites in the Parish a set out on p41.  Suggest considering any further updated on the housing position in the emerging Local Plan review at this point.  This is likely to be controversial but will make the plan more robust and easier for the Parish and community to defend sites being bought forward by developers that are not allocated.	The Parish Council intend to review the neighbourhood plan as soon as the Local Plan has reached an advanced stage, at which point the need and advantage of allocating sites can be reviewed
	P13	Check percentage figure of total unitary resident population.		Noted as 0.22% in the draft plan. Checked and will be amended to 0.2%
	P16	Is there a specific reason to choose 2030? The third para talks about new housing, but the sets out earlier in the document that there is no need in this current plan period.	Suggest the period to be 2036, to tie in with the Local Plan Review.	The Parish Council intend to review the neighbourhood plan as soon as the Local Plan has reached an advanced stage, at which point the plan period can be extended if necessary to align with the Local Plan and its evidence base.
	Section 5.1	Building materials are listed for Seend Cleeve, but not Seend.	Suggest updating this section to be consistent.	Updated as suggested.
	Policy SP3, p26	Whilst the Irene Usher Memorial Pavilion is a valued community asset, it does not share the same time depth as the other structures on the list.	Recommend including: - the Horse Pond at Spout Lane, as this is quite a unique feature (and therefore remove from the local green space section, as it's not a 'useable space' as such). - Cleeve House. Recommend removing Irene Usher Memorial Pavilion to a different section	The Horse Pond is a unique space and though not usable, it is felt that it fits the criteria for LGS. Cleeve House - Representative responded to informal consultation indicating that they did not wish Cleeve House to be listed as a local heritage asset, due to a worry constraints it would place on the organisation. SG considered response and decided not to include.
	P29	Delighted to see my landscape analysis plan included here! Remove second bracket at the end of the plan title.		Noted and amended
	P31	I fully support the local view north from Seend Bridge (just to note that this is additional to the ones I originally identified).	Suggest to check that all the key views are from public vantage points. The one closest to Bowerhill is from within a field rather than a Public Right of Way (PRoW). The one on the right hand bend on the A365 at Sells Green is from a road rather than a footpath, suggest to relocate at the end of the PRoW? Update Key Views Report too	These 2 view markers have been moved on map
	P33	Suggest to add the allotments as a separate colour.		Amended
	P37	Suggest to summarise the key characteristics of each of the character areas here, or link back to the evidence base.		See updated pages 21 and 22
	P52	I fully support the planting of a woodland on the field west of the Barge Inn. I suggested that this parcel was included as one of the LGS's.	Is there any need to increase allotment capacity.	Neither Seend P.C. or the W.I. have a waiting list for allotments. During the consultation stage no evidence was gathered to suggest that parishioners required allotments in different areas of the Parish as to the ones we have. Therefore no current need to increase allotment capacity is required.
	P55	The inclusion of the image of The Brewery on this page conveys that this is a community led affordable housing, which this building isn't.	Replace the image on p55 with an image of the existing areas of affordable housing or show a plan indicating the Park Farm site	The Steering Group have decided to have no photo on this page.

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Character Statement Comments P31	Include the caravan park behind the 3 Magpies on the plan too.		Amended
	Green Infrastructure Report	Photo which is captioned 'Love Lane'. Does Love Lane run north to south between Inmarsh and the High Street?	Suggest to replace image/	SG to provide a new photo of Love Walk
	Map 3	Suggest defining the allotment areas differently to recreation space, as they are distinctly different uses and user groups.	There are a number of additional circular walks that are important to the village and should be added to the plan:  1. From Church Lane along School Lane to the rear of the community centre to Rusty Lane; back to the church from Rusty Lane. 2. Along Rusty Lane to the footpath cross roads, right through the paddock to the rear of the rec ground and back to the High Street through Cooks Close and snicket, east along the High Street towards Inmarsh and around the back of The Manor to join up with the 'key circular walk'.	Map amended
	Para4.4.2	B – Field south of churchyard to be extended.	Suggest to reword, assuming it is the churchyard to be extended, not the field.	The SG have discussed and note no extension of the churchyard is required. The area marked already belongs to the Holy Cross church and it intended for an extension to the graveyard in due course.
	Local Key Views Report P13	Amend viewpoint reference to Seend Bridge House.	Update to address comments in NP section above.	Viewpoint reference amended in the Local key Views Report.
		Overall, pleased to see that this document includes views to and from the key villages.		Noted with thanks

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
Ref.No. 17.28.03	P39 Obj. 6 policy SP8	<p>I suggest that Community Facilities, 2. Seend Primary School be amended to include the school play area including the field and playground. I note that this is the case with the Lye Field and the Irene Usher Memorial Pavilion at 9 and 16 in the same list.</p> <p>The Seend Primary school facility is of significant importance to parish life and to the viability and resilience of our community. It has not gone un-noticed that in February 2020 The White Horse Federation is in the process of attempting to sell school playing fields at Devizes School  <a href="https://www.gazetteandherald.co.uk/news/18232253.trust-accused-asset-stripping-devizes-schools-bid-2m-sale-playing-fields/">https://www.gazetteandherald.co.uk/news/18232253.trust-accused-asset-stripping-devizes-schools-bid-2m-sale-playing-fields/</a>.</p> <p>Is the Seend Parish Council aware of the land and building asset ownership arrangements for Seend School? Is the building owned by the White Horse Federation with the grounds being owned by the Church of England? There is no evidence that our plan contains policies protecting any part of these assets, or helping achieve the aspiration mentioned in 4.1 Vision on page 16.</p> <p>Ownership should be established and policies within the draft NP should be formulated to protect our school and its playing area.</p> <p>In my view, the Seend School may be vulnerable to a spectrum of threats, or unintended consequences, arising from changes in local primary school provision and academy asset management.</p> <p>The White Horse Federation (WHF) controls a number of local primary schools in proximity to Seend, such as Bowerhill Primary, Forest and Sandridge Primary and Five Lanes Primary at Worton, which was moved from Potterne in 2019. There must be a presumption that WHF will also control the new Bowerhill primary school now in construction at Pathfinder Way. This new school, which is just 3.4km from Seend Primary, is initially a one-form entry school with a 10-year option to expand to 2-form entry. Land area for expansion has been included in the new 1.6 hectare site. In view of the continuing south-eastern expansion of Melksham, the decision to commit to a 2-form entry school at Pathfinder Way may have already been made.</p> <p>WHF obviously needs the flexibility to change school catchment areas to meet the demands and needs of education. WHF has proposed changes to the Forest and Sandridge school catchment from September 2020.</p>	Amend SP to include the school buildings and grounds.	Amended

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
		<p>It is clear that the WHA is business minded and is swift to rationalise its estate when necessary. The Seend Primary site is comprised of fairly old buildings with more recent additions. The ad hoc nature of the buildings must have attendant relatively high running costs when compared to the newer facilities built at Forest and Sandridge and Worton and the forthcoming facility at Pathfinder Way. A further consideration is the size of the available school recreation area, which is now at, or below, the DfE Area Guideline for the size of the pupil cohort. People with longer memories will recall the sale of school land to build Somerset Close. There is insufficient land on the Seend site to expand further, if expansion ever becomes necessary. In my view, the more likely scenario is that the continuing expansion of Melksham will generate more primary facilities that will eventually overtake the Seend primary catchment and we will have our primary children educated at a peripheral Melksham facility whilst our school and land is sold for development.</p> <p>Many of these factors lead to the question of how sure Seend can be that it will retain its school in the long-term in the light of economic influences within WHA and the local primary school developments both planned and yet to planned. One way to deal with this issue is to designate local land for a replacement school should it ever be deemed necessary. After all, Seend School serves Seend and the surrounding rural settlements so this should be seen as a reasonable proposition and one that would be eagerly taken up by Wiltshire Council at the appropriate time. This would meet the long-term aspiration alluded to in the draft plan.</p> <p>I am uncomfortable with the fact that the draft plan has more to say about the condition of the WI Hall than the future of the school under 5.3 Community Facilities on page 38. The NP evidence base says the school is oversubscribed and the school confirms this is still the case in March 2020 with the current roll at 119 against a capacity of 112. The plan should provide this detail as a useful benchmark for future plan revision.</p>	Contact the landowners of development sites >1.7 hectares offered under the NP with a view to designate such land for a future school.	The Parish Council intend to review the neighbourhood plan as soon as the Local Plan has reached an advanced stage, at which point the need and advantage of allocating sites can be reviewed
Ref.No. 18.30.03	Character	This is a fantastic overview of our parish. What really stood out to me was the range and variety of features. I particularly liked the references to the many examples of open character and extensive views.		Noted with thanks
	Facilities	All good but the Methodist chapel in Seend is no longer running services. Also the new owner of the Brewery is not named.	Could this be updated now?	Detail amended in Community Facilities Report. Name of new landlady of the Brewery Inn has been confirmed but included in report as 'Private Owner'.
	Green Infrastructure	Again all good, and strongly agree the need for a footpath from Old Station yard to the Bath road.	Look at all possible options for linking Seend Cleeve/ the canal towpath to Bath Road.	This has been considered as an aspiration in the G.I. report and also in the Highways & Traffic section of the NDP.
	Traffic	Very well researched document.  Moving the bus stop seems very sensible. My teenage children have had to cross there for the last eight years at 8am and 6pm to catch their school bus, and say how dangerous it is, especially in the dark.	A 20 MPH speed limit along the whole of Seend High Street seems to be sensible proposal for keeping pedestrians and cyclists safe, dissuading HGV and speeders from taking the A361 thereby regaining a more rural feel to our village.	Noted, though speed limits are outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Ref.No. 19.30.03	p.8	The buses that run along the A365 are now the X72 and the D3		The steering group have discussed and suggest any bus route numbers are removed and only the destinations mentioned. Suggest to check timetables at bus stops or look online to for the applicable information.
	p. 12	The road through the Cleeve does not directly join the A365 – the C20 does		Wording amended

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	pp 12,39 & more incl maps	The Methodist Chapel gets quite a few mentions but ceased operation on 8th March		Community Facilities Report amended to reflect this.  The SG group feel reference to The Methodist Chapel could start with the word historic. Even though active worshipping has ceased the Methodist Chapel is still an important historic building."
	p.50	Typo – update should be updated		Amended
	p.51	Typo – according should be according to		Amended
	p.53	A bit concerned that it seems to be assumed that the whole of New Buildings wants a pavement. Not true. Some of us would prefer warning signs of people in road or similar.	Please can the PC ensure that the residents of New Buildings, the bungalow and Little Mitchell's Farm are consulted before anything happens. Thanks.	Text added in to note the parish residents would be consulted
		No mention of pavement over where the railway bridge used to be on Bollands Hill. I'm sure I Post-It-Noted that and would be surprised if nobody else did. People are scared of walking down there to access the bus stop.	Any chance of this being added in – implicitly or explicitly – at this late stage?	Addressed in points about road safety
Ref.No. 20.30.03	Evidence Base Report pg10 Map 6	The 'Legend' next to the map is incorrect. Currently it shows the habitats in Seend incorrectly as being coastal saltmarsh and sand dunes!. The legend should show only the 'Woodland' and 'Other' categories in MAGIC mapping which I believe are the only ones relevant to Seend. See attached map.	The map legend to be replaced. For details refer to: <a href="https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx">https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx</a>	This is the legend that is printed with the map. Will attempt to change the legend if possible.
	Evidence Base Report pg13 4.4.4 Point i	I strongly agree with the aspiration to provide better walking access to Seend Cleeve from the Bath Road. However, I found the wording of this point a little confusing, in particular the reference to 'the diagonal footpath which runs east to west'.	Wording of 4.4.4 to be reviewed.	The wording the G.I. report has been reviewed and amended.
	EVERYTHIN G ELSE	EXCELLENT WORK EVERYONE!	PATS ON BACKS ALL ROUND :)	Noted with thanks
Ref.No. 21.01.04 & 21.01.04 HRA		We welcome the publication of the draft neighbourhood plan and the significant progress this represents. As you know, we have been working with you over a number of years to support the preparation of the Plan, but this consultation gives a formal opportunity for the Council to comment and make suggestions. Our focus is to ensure that the plan generally conforms to the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and the proposed policies would be effective in achieving their stated objectives through the determination of individual planning applications. We will also provide views where policies raise issues of potential conflict with national policy. The draft Plan represents a considerable amount of work which is commendable, involving many interests in the local community. It encompasses a wide range of issues, drawing on previous documents and updating the evidence base, and pulling them together in a coherent way. The Plan comes across as well written and clearly presented. The link between vision, objectives and policies is clear and shows that it has been well thought through.		
	Intoduction Section 1.3, third paragraph	"... including those on a list of statutory consultees agreed with Wiltshire Council" –	Please amend this to say 'in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as amended'. WC provided an example list as a starting point, and set out the requirements of the regulations. The list was not agreed as such.	Amended as suggested
	Section 1.3, 4th paragraph, on page 6	The neighbourhood plan will not form a material consideration. It will be part of the development plan itself.	Therefore the final sentence should be deleted.	Deleted

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	2 Seend Parish: A summary description Section 2.1	The first sentence is not accurate. Seend Village is categorised in the Wiltshire Core Strategy as a 'Large Village', but it is not a Civil Parish. The 'Kennet District' no longer exists, so it would be best to remove this reference, or if it still represents cultural significance, please use 'former Kennet District'. The current reference would be Melksham Community Area, which would be worth including as it is referred to in later chapters.	Suggested amendment: "Seend is a Civil Parish located in ..." include the reference of Seend Village as a large village either at the end of paragraph 2, or leave it out all together from this section as it is covered in section 3.1.	Amended as suggested
	Figure 3	The inclusion of the Conservation Area on this map seems out of place. The map seems to be showing the settlements of the parish and the various sizes and their built up areas. It might make more sense to show the limits of development / settlement boundary instead of the conservation area. If doing this, it would need to be referenced in the legend and text.		Map amended
	Figure 4	It would be helpful for the text to explain what the map shows / reference the map within the text e.g. "as shown in Figure 4". – Same for all maps and figures.		Actioned throughout
	Photographs	Some photographs have captions. This is helpful. I appreciate that photos are a later addition to the document, so for the next draft it would be helpful to add captions explaining the photographs.		Captions added throughout
	Section 3.0, 2nd paragraph	The information about the status of the Wiltshire Local Plan review may need updating prior to submission. We can assist with an update / wording at the time, or through the Regulation 16 consultation. This could be an appropriate place to mention the Seend NP plan period, within the context of the Local Plan time period.		Noted and NDP time period updated
	Section 3.1, 2nd paragraph	This paragraph mentions the settlement boundary. Please refer to the maps where the SB is shown.		Actioned
	3.1 4th paragraph	This paragraph could be made a little clearer that it is talking about new development, rather than any proposals for employment opportunities.	At the end of this paragraph could be an appropriate place to mention the settlement boundary, and that a revised SB has been recently adopted, through the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan and is shown at Appendix 3.	Amended as suggested
	3.1, 6th paragraph	This paragraph talks about the Melksham Community Area.	The community area could be mentioned in the introduction to provide context.	Mention added
	3.1, 6th paragraph.	Could be clearer that the current plan period of the WCS is to 2026. "... and also demonstrates that the indicative housing requirement for the community area has been exceeded for this plan period (to 2026).		Amended as suggested
	Figure 5	A more appropriate title might be "Wiltshire Core Strategy policy map for the Seend area (including saved policies of the Kennet Local Plan (KLP) and West Wiltshire Local Plan (WWLP))"		Amended as suggested
	Section 4.2	Objective 1 – use "conserve and enhance" rather than "protect" as the latter implies strictly no change.		Amended as suggested
		The Local Key Views Report supporting the Policy SP4: Landscape and Local Key Views will be a useful tool for recording and managing landscape change.	Could the Parish could make a commitment to reviewing these key views e.g. every 5 years?	The Seend P.C. committed to reviewing the NDP in 5years at the Seend P.C. Meeting 26th May 2020. This would include the Key Views.

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Section 5.0, 2nd paragraph	The NPPF is actually a material consideration and not part of the development plan, so please remove that part of the sentence. There are more elements of the development plan than just the Wiltshire Core Strategy, although the WCS together with the Seend Parish NP will be the most relevant parts for Seend Parish. See <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-policy">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planning-policy</a>	Suggested change: "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission are determined in 'accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise' and the Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan, together with the <del>National Planning Policy Framework and Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy</del> <b>and saved policies of the Kennet Local Plan, are the key parts of</b> for the current development plan for Seend Parish."	Amended as suggested
	Policies and Objectives matrix	This table provides a very helpful overview of the policies and objectives, and shows the plan has been well thought-through.		Noted with thanks
	Section 5.1, 4th paragraph onwards	It might be helpful to use subheadings for the different character areas, as these are referenced in a number of policies.		Updated
	Section 5.1, 7th paragraph	The sentence at the end of this paragraph provides some specific factors to consider in design. Might it be helpful to include this sentence in policy SP1?		Policy revised in line with comment and suggestions
	Policy SP1	The phrase 'positive characteristics' is open to interpretation and may need to be defined more clearly to be implemented. Using the sentence mentioned above could be helpful, as would a more specific reference to key parts of the character statement. E.g. 'responding to and integrating with the positive characteristics of the natural and built environment, as set out in the Seend Parish Character Statement' [check that the Character Statement sets out positive characteristics specifically] As written this policy does not add much to Core Policy 57.	To strengthen this policy, it is suggested that 'should' is replaced with 'must', and consideration should be given as to whether the policy should require applicants to submit a design compliance statement to 'demonstrate how it has responded to the character area...' and the supporting text could explain further what is required e.g. a design compliance statement must be submitted with all applications, demonstrating with annotated images how proposals satisfy the guidance contained in the Seend Parish Character Statement.	Policy revised in line with comment and suggestions
		The NP policies might find it useful to make specific reference to some of the following, because the Core Policy does not and so this is an opportunity of neighbourhood planning to be more specific and up-to-date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Design Guide - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide</a></li> <li>• Building for Life 12 - <a href="https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/building-life-12-third-edition">https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/building-life-12-third-edition</a></li> <li>• National Space Standards – evidence may be required to enforce this.</li> <li>• <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524531/160519_Nationally_Described_Space_Standard_Final_Web_version.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524531/160519_Nationally_Described_Space_Standard_Final_Web_version.pdf</a></li> <li>• The National Model Design Code, if and when it is produced - <a href="https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2019-10-01/HCWS1840/">https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2019-10-01/HCWS1840/</a></li> </ul>		Reference to the National Design Guide included
	SP1 Explanation , 3rd paragraph	"Positive characteristics" need to be defined. In Seend Parish this will mean reflecting positive characteristics of local character areas (as defined in the Seend Parish Character Statement) and historic interest in a sensitive way that contributes to the rich local variety.		Amended
	Explanation , 4th paragraph	Add "Developers are encouraged to use this to demonstrate how the proposal delivers locally sensitive design."		Added as suggested

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	5.1 Conserving the distinctive Qualities of our Built and Natural Environment - Archaeology and historic landscape character	It is noted that the county Historic Environment Record (HER) has been consulted relating principally to archaeology and historic landscape character, and it is welcomed that the full list has been included as an appendix. Notwithstanding this, the policies that relate to heritage seem to focus only on built heritage and the conservation area, with archaeology only being mentioned in the historic background of Seend parish.	Further mention would be welcomed, for example the acknowledgement that heritage comprises archaeology as well as historic buildings / structures. Archaeology can add to the character and sense of place and people walking and accessing heritage sites can have a role in wellbeing. This could be done by expanding on the information provided in relation to Objective 10 – 'to identify and support the conservation of the parish heritage, including identified locally valued heritage assets'. When looking at appropriate development and future aspirations, heritage can be seen as a positive force for change and not merely something to conserve / preserve, for example it could influence design, the wellbeing agenda or help to define local distinctiveness, and what it is that makes Seend a unique place. This could be explored further in this section of the plan as well as the sections on landscape and design.	Further mention added into the Plan
	Policy SP2	This policy provides useful criteria for development management officers which will aid implementation. The policy asks that development must demonstrate that it has had regard to the Seend Conservation Area Statement and the Seend Parish Character Statement.	Again, to strengthen this policy, consider how an applicant would demonstrate this. In addition, you may wish to consider how to discourage ubiquitous use of white uPVC as it is commonly proposed for windows, doors, garage doors, facias and barge boards by volume developers, and these have a profound influence of character. The policy could suggest preferred alternatives – materials and colours. It could be useful to state "natural" stone, for the avoidance of doubt, otherwise reconstituted stone might be the default. State that chimney stacks should be integral with building and not Glass Reinforced Plastic stuck on features, as often happens. Possibly state these should be decorative, and functional, concealing vents or ducts. Consider if there are any of these features that might be appropriate outside of the Conservation Area as well. If this is the case, they could be added as specific detail within policy SP1.	Policy amended in line with comment and suggestions
	Policy SP3	Shouldn't this policy be related to objective 10 as well as objective 3? Could Figure 8 be made clearer?  It is noted that the list includes the Vicarage Wall which is actually a grade II listed building Ref 1243833 We would question the inclusion of the Irene Usher Memorial Pavilion as although it is clearly a community building of community value, it does not appear to meet any the criteria set out for assessing an actual heritage asset. It may be better to designate this as a community facility instead as has been done in policy SP8		Vicarage Wall has been removed from this policy as it is listed (along with the door in the wall). The Irene Usher Memorial Pavilion is already listed as a community facility but it was considered to meet Historic England criteria of Historic Association "Associated with an historical person or event of acknowledged note (including important local figures or events, for example landowner, commemorative event, charity, ecclesiastical or other community group and former resident)" Further detail has been added to the Local Heritage Assets Report as to why this is considered to meet the criteria for a local heritage asset.
	Character Assessment	Detail on actual buildings i.e. heights, layout, materials could be given more prominence. For example, policies SP1 and SP2 to be stronger if they included key characteristics identified in the character assessment, such as those listed on page 17.		Policies revised in line with comments and suggestions

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Landscape and Green Infrastructure Section 5.2, first paragraph	Is the special feature really relating to just the Conservation Area? Or perhaps it is the whole of Seend Village that is relevant here?		Amended to reflect that it is whole of Seend Village
	Note on A350 Melksham Bypass Proposal	"should the Bypass proceed, the protection of the setting of the canal should be a key consideration"	It may be worth considering whether to include this direction within policy (perhaps within policy SP7?), and if doing so it would be worth setting out what elements of the canal setting in particular should be considered and how should they be managed. It is helpful that the Canal setting is defined on Figure 12. The text relating to the A350 and the canal setting should reference it (i.e. as shown on Figure 12)	Note updated and Policy SP7 amended in line with comment and suggestions
	Historic landscape	The acknowledgement of how the parish's landscape in an important material consideration is welcomed. Information from the Landscape Character Assessment is used to outline the present visuals and value in the local landscape, however there may well be elements of historic landscape character that have an influence on the sense of place and character of the present day village its environs. This information was provided along with the HER data, and could be further explored (even with just some short statements (in relation to Objective 1 – 'to protect the sensitive and distinctive landscape of Seend Parish'. Some of the important / valued views may be treated as such because of their historic landscape character, an where this is the case it would be beneficial to note it.		The Local Key Views Report has been amended.
	Landscape and Key Views Policy SP4	The policy aligns with WCS policy. The word 'must' could be used instead of 'should' to strengthen the policy.		Policy amended in line with suggestions
	Supporting document "Local Key Views Report"	The Local Key Views Report supporting the Policy SP4: Landscape and Local Key Views will be a useful tool for recording and managing landscape change.	The Parish Council may wish to make a commitment to reviewing these key views e.g. every 5 years?	The Parish Council will review the Local Key Views report in line with the review of the NDP. This will be in 5years as agreed at the Seend P.C. meeting 26th May 2020.
	Green Infrastructure Policy Sp5	The policy is welcomed, though the wording of the policy is somewhat weaker than other policies in the plan which require proposals to 'protect and enhance' whereas policy SP5 includes the wording 'should' and 'where possible'. For example the policy does not say that development should be avoided if it cannot fulfil the criteria.	The policy could be strengthened if it used wording such as 'must'. Given the climate and ecological crisis and the need to maintain and enhance GI, the policy wording could be strengthened so it is more akin to other policies in the NP that aim to protect features and to deter development from taking place in key areas. We would also suggest that the policy should actively discourage development that could affect GI and should specify that any such development would not be supported. The policy could also require planning applications to refer to the Green Infrastructure Report and demonstrate how they can deliver the GI priorities, where appropriate and relevant to the proposal.	Policy amended in line with comment and suggestions

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
		The locally-specific parts of this policy (i.e. where it adds further detail to Core Policy 52) are the references to the assets on Figure 10.	opportunities could be identified on another map, as discussed below. In relation to ii and iii are there any opportunities for improvement already identified by the Parish Council / community that development could contribute to or that could be listed as a 'parish project'? These are included in the Green Infrastructure Report, but it might be worth highlighting the key ones in the policy or supporting text. To this end, it would be beneficial to include Map 7 within the neighbourhood plan itself. In relation to iii, it would be helpful to show the thinking and aspirations as to whether the existing network satisfies all the important desire lines, or are there any footpath links missing that could be introduced in future; Or are there any that need enhancement in some way, perhaps to improve accessibility to all? Perhaps colour code these on a map. Are there any areas where additional tree planting might be desired? Or where any seating might be valued? Some of these aspects are included in the Green Infrastructure Report, but it might be worth mapping the footpath improvements in that report, or in the main body of the neighbourhood plan.	Map 7 from GI report included in Plan. Map amended to improve readability for in the Plan.
	Biodiversity / natural environment	As currently written it is considered that policy SP5 does not sufficiently provide for biodiversity objectives.	Clearly there is overlap between GI and biodiversity but it would be beneficial to include a policy dedicated to biodiversity, as has been done with landscape and heritage for example, that would require the protection of the natural environment, semi-natural habitats and biodiversity, should a development come forward in the parish. In light of the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 and the forthcoming Environment Bill for all development (with certain exceptions) to deliver biodiversity net gain (BNG), we would suggest that the wording of Policy SP5 is amended to reflect the need for new development to deliver a BNG, rather than the desired outcome set out within the current for BNG to only be delivered 'where possible.' In addition, it may be useful for the policy or accompanying text to specify the sorts of enhancements that the NP Group would like to be delivered, such as native tree planting in appropriate areas, or the creation of wildflower meadows.	SP5 and supporting text has been updated
	Green Infrastructure supporting text and Map (Fig 10)	The supporting text to policy SP5 focuses on PRoW including footpaths and bridleways, and whilst these features are important there is limited reference to other GI assets that comprise a critical element of GI networks such as established hedgerows and green corridors, ancient and veteran trees, open countryside, parks and gardens, waterways and riparian corridors (rivers and streams). The latter is sometimes referred to as blue-green infrastructure.	Figure 10 titled Existing Green Infrastructure, identifies SSSIs, woodlands, orchards, the canal, recreational spaces and PRoW, but does not identify other likely assets such as those in the aforementioned list, including 'important' and established hedgerows, ancient and veteran trees, rivers/streams such as Semington Brook and Summerham Brook along the Parish boundary, and ponds. It should be noted that all these features comprise key elements of the GI network.	Figure 10 amended to include the brooks that run through the Parish. Supporting text amended to note other key features of GI in the Parish, including important in the Conservation Area Statement.
	Green Infrastructure Report	Paragraph 4.4.1 "B. Field south of churchyard to be extended." It is unclear what this means. Does it mean that there is an aspiration for the churchyard to be extended into the field to the south? C. - This may also need to be clarified. Is the intention that the bridleway is to be improved, in order to improve access to school from a certain direction?		This has been reviewed and amended in the G.I. report.
	Community Facilities Policy SP8	The circumstances where loss of a community facility might be acceptable might also include the situation when it can be demonstrated that it is no longer needed. In addition to the existing community facilities, are there any community facilities needed in relation to transport, e.g. bus stops / shelters / seats / lighting, covered bike racks?		Policy amended in line with comment and suggestions
	Supporting Appropriate Future Development 5.4, para 2	The final sentence says 'The Parish has aspirations' - it might be useful to clarify whether this is the 'Parish Council' or the 'community'.		The word 'community' inserted

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Pre-app community engagement Policy SP9	The content of policy SP9 would not normally be contained within a policy, and is essentially guidance. As explained in the supporting text on page 42, the National Planning Policy Framework explains that applicants cannot legally be required to undertake early stage community involvement. Therefore, the policy cannot require it and it would not	It might be beneficial if the plan could specifically state that pre-app community engagement is also expected for Reserved Matters Applications as well as Outline or Full, as a reminder, and to give a clear message to developers.	The policy seeks to be in line with good practice and advice from the Secretary of State. The wording reflects paragraph 128 of the NPPF and seeks to apply through policy at the local level. Policy amended as suggested.
	Small and Infill Development Section title	It may be more accurate to change the section title to something like "Location of Development" as the policy is not just about infill but about location of development elsewhere in the parish.		Amended
	Policy SP11	Criteria iv and v may be better placed within policy SP1		These criteria are drafted specifically for any infill but do link to policy SP1.
	Explanation following policy SP11	First paragraph, final sentence: "... and will be considered on their individual merits against National and the development plan" a word seems to be missing, perhaps "guidance" or "policy"?		Amended
	Page 46	It is not clear what the photo images are meant to convey – the bottom one looks like a generic housing development and road layout – is this OK?		This photo is of Cook's Close. Captions now added to clarify.
	Custom and Self-build Housing Policy SP12	Would slightly more diversity in materials and style be accepted in self build houses? Part of the motivation to undertake self-build may be more control over appearance, materials and budgets. It could be helpful if the plan takes a view on this. In particular there may be 'eco' materials which are not so common in the area presently.		Policy amended
	Climate Change and Sustainable Design Policy SP13	Consider changing to "Seend Parish encourages developers to positively address issues relating to the climate" (as it is not just environmental issues that affect the climate or are affected by it) The policy wording is somewhat broad and leaves it to developers to interpret what sustainable design might include.	It might be helpful for the policy or supporting text to give some examples of what might be expected, or what outcome might be expected (e.g. a % carbon reduction, or zero carbon). One example would be to include the requirement for the delivery of habitat enhancement and native tree and shrub planting in appropriate areas to help sequester carbon and serve as runoff attenuation, or; incorporate suitable drainage and flood risk management measures to address the potential for an increase in flood risk as a result of climate change; electric vehicle charging etc. Consider including water efficiency as well as energy efficiency. In relation to "sustainable design", consider including design that is adapted or adaptable to a changed climate. The community is strongly encouraged to consider climate change adaptation measures with regards flood risk.	Policy amended

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Drainage / flood risk / resilience	<p>The parish is bordered by several main rivers. The Summerham Brook and Semmington Brook runs along the southern and western border, and the Clackers Brook runs along the northern border. Sections of the A361 at either end of the parish, and land adjacent to the main rivers are in flood zones 2 &amp; 3.</p> <p>In addition, land adjacent to ordinary watercourses (non main rivers) are at risk of surface water flooding, which can impact on access and egress and affect property. Groundwater flood maps indicate that parts of the parish could be at risk of groundwater flooding, which ties in with the neighbourhood plan text describing that early water supplies relied on wells (section 2.2). It would be helpful for the drainage team to receive information on well levels in Seend in view of the recent concerns about rising groundwater around the county.</p> <p>The Kennet and Avon Canal bisects the parish. A number of canal breaches and overtoppings have been recorded along the section running through the parish. In light of this information, the neighbourhood plan does not mention flood risk or Core Policy 67. It is noted that the neighbourhood plan is likely to be reviewed when the Wiltshire Local Plan is adopted. Flood risk from all sources (river, surface water, groundwater, canals) should be considered in any future plan reviews and site assessments and should make reference to the Council's Development Guidance for groundwater particularly if considering SuDS.</p>	<p>For consideration, perhaps in the 'future projects' section: The community does not have a flood plan or a contact in the event of a weather emergency. The flood risk to homes and business within the parish is from rivers, surface water and groundwater but no reports have been received by the team from Seend.</p> <p>If the parish do not wish to consider a flood plan they should at the very least have a nominated contact in the event of a weather or other emergency and consider developing an emergency plan which would include pandemic.</p>	<p>This item was discussed at the Seend P.C. Meeting held on 26th May by a Virtual ZOOM Meeting. The clerk has a flood plan to complete and she will now undertake to do this with the aid of a sub-committee of Parish Councillors.</p>
	Highways and Traffic 5.5, 2nd para	<p>3rd bullet point perhaps needs clarification. It appears to suggest that more parking is required in narrow lanes.</p> <p>6th bullet point. Increased use of the roads by HGVs is not supported by the evidence that we have available: Current HGV statistics both National and regional/local would suggest that HGV traffic has remained fairly consistent (if not reduced) in the UK. Van and LCV (light commercial vehicles) has increased significantly.</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/808555/road-traffic-estimates-in-great-britain-2018.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/808555/road-traffic-estimates-in-great-britain-2018.pdf</a> for context (first Chart).</p>		<p>These bullet points reviewed. Bullet point 3 updated. Bullet point 6 to remain. Traffic &amp; Highway report produced to add as an appendix.</p>
	Policy SP14	<p>This policy aligns with WCS and NPPF, however as such, this policy duplicates WCS policy, whereby a transport assessment would be required.</p> <p>It might be worth highlighting the key road safety concerns within the policy or supporting text.</p>		<p>Noted and policy updated</p>
	Road Safety Report	<p>For information, Accident data from the last three years suggest 6 slight accidents within the area. Main cluster sight is XROADS OF A361 TROWBRIDGE RD &amp; C20 BELL HILL, SEEND, which seems to show a reduction from that reported in the Road safety report.</p>		<p>Noted</p>
	6. Plan Review	<p>The approach to reviewing the neighbourhood plan is welcomed, and the mechanism is clearly set out.</p>		<p>Noted with thanks</p>
	7 Future Projects: Priorities and Aspirations 7.1 Projects List	<p>Fourth paragraph.</p>	<p>It might be helpful to identify on a map the potential area for tree planting. This might be covered, if a map of GI opportunities is added, as per the comment on policy SP5 above, and the supporting text in section 7 refers to it.</p>	<p>This area is identified as 'E' on Map 7 in the GI Report (Map 7 - Aspirations for Enhancement Diagram). To be included in Plan (see comment regarding SP5 above)</p>

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
	Highways and pedestrian safety, page 53, bullet points	<p>It is not clear whether these bullet points are 'aims' or perhaps scheme ideas? I would suggest an aim is to reduce traffic speed where as traffic calming is a scheme or project.</p> <p>"road sign appraisal" – please clarify whether this is a "road sign audit"? In this scenario, "street clutter" should also be assessed.</p> <p>In relation to "traffic calming" (3rd bullet) - Strict policies and criteria apply to placing traffic calming on 'A' roads. The feasibility of any concept will need to be checked and agreed by engineers. At the last count the 85th percentile speed recorded was under the threshold to be eligible for Speed Watch, 34.6mph. Survey date approx 12 months ago.</p>		Page 53 reviewed and wording changed.
	Page 54	The list of projects should be referenced from the Green Infrastructure policy section. If any of the projects might require planning permission in future, it might be useful to include a supportive clause in policy SP5.		Amended and supportive clause inserted
	Page 55	Community Led Affordable Housing. This section describes the project led by Seend Community Land and Asset Trust to deliver affordable housing. For information, the membership of the CLT is now larger than the figure given in the Neighbourhood Plan.		Noted
	Appendix 3 Settlement Boundary	The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan is now adopted and Wiltshire Council can provide an up to date map of the adopted settlement boundary.		Noted and replaced
	Habitats Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment	<p>SEA and HRA screening reports should be submitted alongside all other documents at Reg 15 stage, and it is usual practice to mention the need (or otherwise) for HRA and SEA within the main plan document. Please be aware that if any changes are subsequently made to the plan after Reg 14, and if the changes are likely to have significant environmental effects e.g. policy changes or allocation of development sites, the Qualifying Body must request revised SEA and HRA screening determinations from the Council.</p> <p>The Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2030 (Regulation 14 Consultation Draft Version 15th February 2020 – 28th March 2020) has been reviewed, alongside the draft Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2030 (Working Draft Version 7, November 2019) that was submitted for HRA screening in November 2019.</p> <p>The policies have been re-arranged in the current version of the NP with a few policy titles having been slightly altered, and the wording of some of the policies having been amended. Therefore, although the content of the policies has not materially altered, it has been necessary to update the HRA accordingly and this is attached. The conclusion of the HRA remains unchanged.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council confirm that HRA and SEA assessment were not needed for the Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		Included text in the introductory section page 5: Strategic environmental assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been undertaken by Wiltshire Council, who confirmed that HRA and SEA assessment were not needed for the Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
Ref.No. 22.01.04		An admirable document but it does not consider one threat to orderly expansion, that is the sale of small parcels of bare agricultural land which the purchasers then develop into unauthorised small holdings. The planning authority's ability to police these developments is questionable. The result is a usage that is disorderly and unsightly and a loss of confidence in the enforcement powers of local authorities.	Consultation with WCC to gauge the scale of this problem and to consider a commensurate solution.	This is an enforcement issue.

**Seend Parish Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement**  
**Appendix 12 - Complete log of Regulation 14 comments received and responses**  
**from Steering Group**

Ref. Number	Page / Clause / Para	Respondent's Comment	Respondent's Proposal (where relevant)	Resolution
Ref.No. 23.02.04	P33 Policy SP5	<p>Local Green Space Designations:</p> <p>Giles Wood has not been included on the list of Local Green Space Designations.</p> <p>The Parish Council feel given its importance to the community with its recreational value, as a place of tranquility, and presence of various species of wildlife, this area should be included under this policy.</p>		Giles Wood is now included as a Local Green Space designation.
	P33 Policy SP5 And map on P34	<p>Local Green Space Designations:</p> <p>Bowerhill Residents Picnic Area (BRAG). The protection of the picnic area should be extended to include the bridleway/footpath from Bowerhill, which is used to access both this area and the canal and is home to several memorial benches and fully maintained by members of BRAG</p>		Routeways are already protected by separate public rights of way legislation, so the SG felt it unnecessary to include this as part of the BRAG picnic site LGS. There are other routeways in the parish that have benches along them so this not an unusual situation.