

# **Urchfont Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2026-2038**

26 APRIL 2025 URCHFONT PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP



### APPOINTED AND WORKING ON BEHALF OF URCHFONT PARISH COUNCIL

Trevor Hill

Keith Hills

Al Gordon

Linda Jennings

Sally Stephens

Malcolm Turner

Jackie Waddell



REVIEW OF OUR PROGRESS SINCE OUR LAST PUBLIC MEETING ON 9 NOVEMBER 2024



Every Parish resident will soon for the opportunity to submit their value on future housing development in and around Urchfont

In the next couple of weeks, one survey will be deliver every household in Urchfont Parish. Additional copies

Please take the opportunity to participate in this

PROGRESS SINCE OUR LAST PUBLIC MEETING



- > FEEDBACK FROM QUESTIONNAIRES
- > SOUGHT POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES FROM LANDOWNERS
- > DEVELOPED SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Taking into account what you said in the questionnaires.



SELECTION OF MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



#### **TODAY'S MEETING - STAGE 1**

- > Opportunity for the public to view site locations.
- > Site Assessment Matrix.
- > Understand how the Matrix is used to compare sites.
- > Public drop-in sessions.
- > Public influence on preferred site selection.
- > Next stages.

IT IS
YOUR PLAN
YOUR INPUT &
INVOLVEMENT
IS IMPERATIVE
IN THE
DEVELOPMENT

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES



#### SITES

- > We received Site Submission Forms for 22 potential sites from 12 landowners.
- > 17 of the Sites are in or bordering the Urchfont Village Development Boundary.
- > 5 Sites are beyond Urchfont Village Development Boundary.

#### **CONDITIONS**

- > The selected sites must meet National and Local Planning Policy.
- > The Wiltshire Local Plan requires Urchfont Parish Council to identify sites for 34 new dwellings plus the residual unbuilt numbers from the old Neighbourhood Plan.
- > Must meet environmental and sustainability criteria.
- > Must be capable of being serviced by all public infrastructure.



- **Urchfont Garage**
- Uphill E of Yardlands
- S of Ballingers
- Alcudia
- Withdrawn
- Land opp Sawmills
- Uphill Farm Paddock
- Uphill Workshop
- Uphill Paddock
- Uphill Whole Farm 10
- Rookery Fm Machinery Yd 15
- Land opp Foxley Fields 16
- **17** Lancasters
- 18 Gunpark and Island
- 19 Gunpark only
- 20 **Knowle House**
- Jasmine Cott & Firlings





SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX



- > Includes 26 technical criteria covering such things as traffic impact, visual impact, existing use, trees, affordable houses, housing density, nature constraints, etc.
- > Each site is scored on all technical criteria with ratings from 1 to 4 according to how well it complies. In the case of a serious conflict with any criterion, a score of minus 5 is given.
- > Each criterion has a Weighting Factor of between 1 and 5, with 5 being the most important. The Weighting Factors were set according to public opinion per the Housing Development Questionnaire last year.

SITE ASSESSMENT MATRIX



- > The basic technical score for each criterion is then multiplied by its Weighting Factor to arrive at the initial overall score and a preliminary League Table.
- > This technical assessment table will be available to everyone before the Public Vote.
- > Then, the public vote score will be added to the technical score.
- > All scores are then added, and a final League Table of all sites is produced, with those most suitable at the top.

Serial No.	Criteria	Weighting 1	Assessment Guidelines and Associated Standard Scores <sup>2</sup>					
			4	3	2	1	-5	
1.	Distance from Salisbury Plain Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area	3	Greater than 800m		400m-800m		Less than 400m	
2.	Site of Special Scientific Interest	3	Greater than 800m		400m-800m		Less than 400m	
3.	Distance from any of 7 County Wildlife Sites	3	Greater than 200m	100-200m	Within 100m but not adjacent	Substantially adjacent	Immediately on or directly impacting a designated site	
4.	Proximity to Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	3	At least 500m beyond AONB		Within 500m of AONB but potential for improvement of existing harmful development	Within 500m of AONB	Within AONB with clear negative impact	
5.	Impact on Public Green Space / Recreational areas & facilities	4	Not on or adjacent to Green Space or recreation area		Adjacent to Green Space or recreation area		On site of Green Space or recreation area	
6.	Impact on Listed Building	4	Unlikely to harm setting of listed building		Harm capable of mitigation by appropriate design		Likely to significantly harm setting	
7.	Tree Preservation Orders/trees protected by conservation area designation <sup>3</sup>	3	No TPOs on or adjacent to the site-	TPOs adjacent to the site	TPOs for specimen trees on the site, with scope to work around.	Group TPO on the site or TPO specimens restricting development potential.	Would result in significant loss of or risks to TPO trees.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Weighting = Relative importance factor. This number is used as a multiplier to adjust standard scores according to the relative importance of each criterion as per the Residents' Housing Development Survey 2024. The overall score for each site is achieved by multiplying the score by the weighting for each criterion and adding them to reach a total score. A negative score of -5 is only applied in the case of significant harm or policy conflict, that seriously undermines the suitability of the site for development in planning, environmental or heritage terms, or in cases of major technical feasibility constraints (e.g. criteria 13,14,17,18). The best sites achieve the highest overall scores.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Where any of the criteria are not relevant to any given site, a score of zero is applied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Trees over 75mm diameter in conservation areas are also protected and therefore are considered as having TPO for the purposes of this assessment.

Serial	Criteria	Weighting 1	Assessment Guidelines and Associated Standard Scores <sup>2</sup>					
No.			4	3	2	1	-5	
8.	Efficient use of land: Brownfield sites (e.g. land currently occupied by any form of buildings or structures).	4	Brownfield site which has not been used for business or other valued community use for over 5 years with no realistic prospect of continued use as such.	Brownfield site with existing uses which cause unacceptable nuisance or harm <sup>4</sup> to the local environment or nearby residents.	Brownfield site still in use but with viable proposal to satisfactorily relocate existing use(s). Or brownfield site in use by non-safeguarded use. <sup>5</sup>	Brownfield site recently vacated/ under-used, with some potential to create employment.	Brownfield site currently used for business or other valued community use, with no realistic proposals for appropriate relocation.	
9.	Efficient use of land: maximum reasonable housing density <sup>6</sup>	5	Density maximised to allow mix of house sizes/types including good proportion of 2 & 3-bedroom homes	Medium density with reasonable proportion of 2 & 3- bedroom homes	Density/mix not indicated or low proportion of 2/3 bedroom homes	Low density and mix restricted to predominantly large houses	All large houses at low density.	
10.	Potential affordable housing contribution <sup>7</sup>	5	Site maximised and owner committed to minimum 40% affordable housing		Scheme of 5 units or more, with potential for affordable housing if compliant with policy		Low density market housing scheme designed to avoid affordable housing threshold	
11.	Greenfield Site (e.g. land that has not been developed by any buildings or structures)	3	Greenfield not used as agricultural or community <sup>8</sup> recreational land for at least 20 years	Greenfield not used as agricultural or community recreational land for at least 10 years	Greenfield not used as agricultural or community recreational land for at least 5 years.	Greenfield not used as recreational land for at least 2 years and/or grades 3-5 agricultural land	Currently used, or used within the last 2 years as agricultural (Grades 1-2) or community recreational land	

<sup>4 &</sup>quot;Unacceptable nuisance or harm" is assessed by generally accepted objective and reasonable standards from the point of view of the community as a whole.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> E.g. underutilised storage buildings or other agricultural buildings no longer required, or other use that is not safeguarded by Wiltshire or UPNP Planning Policies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Based on a benchmark range of 15 (low)- 30 (high)dwellings per hectare, and no more than 20% of proposed dwellings having 4 or more bedrooms

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Schemes of less than 5 units (with no affordable housing) due to limited site size score 0 (zero).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For the purposes of this matrix "community recreational use" is intended to include any form of open recreational use available for public use on a non-commercial basis.

Serial	Criteria	Weighting 1	Assessment Guidelines and Associated Standard Scores <sup>2</sup>					
No.			4	3	2	1	-5	
12.	Relationship to the existing defined Urchfont village development boundaries	3	Within currently defined development boundary	Acceptable infill development alongside boundary on 3 sides, with no material intrusion into open countryside	Acceptable extension to development boundary by rounding off to logical physical boundary feature or structure	Adjacent to development boundary with minimal impact on open countryside due to existing physical features	Adjacent to development boundary but intruding harmfully into open countryside beyond development boundary	
13.	Contamination	3	None present	Unlikely	Possible	Suspected	Too poor for housing development	
14.	Topography	3	Flat Site – less than 5- degree slope	Minor part of site sloping between 5 and 15 degrees	Undulation and/or part of site sloping between 5 and 15 degrees	Significant part of site sloping between 5 and 15 degrees	Steep slope – levelling/piling major excavation works required	
15.	Landscape/townscape quality	3	Positive impact on village and surrounding views, settings, or features	Neutral or no impact on village and surrounding views, settings or features	Minor negative impact on village and surrounding views, settings or features	Negative impact on village and surrounding views, settings or features	Intrusive and harmful development	
16.	Conservation Area	4	No likelihood of harmful impact		Potential for harmful impact, unless negated by appropriate design		High potential for harmful impact	
17.	Flooding (drainage issues) <sup>9</sup>	310	No drainage issues – well drained		Part of site within or adjacent to areas with known occurrence of surface water issues.		Poorly drained ground – saturated/standing water after any rainfall/in Flood Risk Zones 2/3	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> The entire area is within E.A. designated Flood Risk Zone 1 (lowest risk rating). Surface water risk is assessed according to E.A. Surface Water Risk Map "High" risk status, i.e. more than 3.3% chance annually.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Criteria items 13,14,17,18, 22, 24 & 26 were not specifically covered by questionnaire (technical/factual assessments rather than judgements) and are therefore given a mid-range weighting.

Serial	Criteria	Weighting 1	Assessment Guidelines and Associated Standard Scores <sup>2</sup>					
No.			4	3	2	1	-5	
18.	Air Quality – proximity to sewage treatment works odour / fly buffer zone north of Urchfont Village	3	Greater than 400m from sewage treatment works		Less than 400m/ greater than 200m from sewage treatment works		Less than 200 metres from sewage treatment works	
19.	Access - community facilities (village hall or village shop, whichever is further)	1	Within 200 metres	Within 400 metres	Within 800 metres	Within 800m but requires crossing classified road; or between 800-1200m	More than 1200 metres	
20.	Access – distance from bus stop	1	Within 200 metres	Within 400 metres	Within 800 metres	Within 1200 metres	More than 1200 metres,	
21.	Access - distance from Urchfont School	1	Within 200 metres – level access pavement/tarmac public path	Within 400 metres, level access, mostly pavement/tarmac public path	Within 800 metres, or 400 metres but undulating route, without some pavement/tarmac public path	Need to cross B3098 or other A or B road or more than 800m, or 400m if undulating and substantially without some pavement/tarmac public path	More than 1200 metres, or 600 metres if undulating and substantially without some pavement/tarmac public path or use of vehicular transport likely	
22.	Feasibility of site access	3	Easy access adequate existing maintained roads – no significant infrastructure required		Existing road and /or site access needs upgrading or widening and/or visibility needs improvement		On blind bend or new roads/ major infrastructure required	

Serial	Criteria	Weighting	Assessment Guidelines and Associated Standard Scores <sup>2</sup>					
No.			4	3	2	1	-5	
23.	Highways and Transport. Access and egress onto road type	3	Directly onto 30/40mph road with limited necessity to travel through village centre		Onto 20mph road but small-medium scale <sup>11</sup> / limited necessity to travel through village centre		Onto 20mph road, large scale development, likely to generate excessive travel through village centre	
24.	Highways and Transport. Access and egress from road <sup>12</sup> with pedestrian safety issues	3	Directly onto road with pavement/tarmac public path on each side of road	Directly onto road with pavement/tarmac public path on nearside road for easy access or potential for same	Directly onto road with one pavement/tarmac public path with necessity for pedestrians to cross the road, or no footpath but potential solution	Directly onto road with no pavement/tarmac public path on either side of road but small-medium scale <sup>7</sup> and minor/no through road	Directly onto road with no pavement/tarmac public path on either side of road and no alternative solution (large scale <sup>10</sup> )	
25.	Traffic Impact	3	No impact on existing local traffic flow	No material or noticeable impact	Minor impact on local roads but no significant movement or safety issues	Material deterioration in local traffic flow or safety	Location already recognised as potential black spot – severe impact on traffic flow/safety	
26.	Footpaths, Bridleways, Cycleways.	3	Development has potential for new/ improved paths/ routes		No impacts or potential improvements		Development would adversely impact routes unless major changes made	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Small scale: 1-4 units; medium scale: 5-9 units; large scale: 10 units and over

<sup>12</sup> Refers to public roads, not private roads



YOUR INPUT TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



#### STAGES OF THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS

> STAGE 1 PUBLIC MEETING (TODAY)

> STAGE 2 FOUR DROP-IN SESSIONS

> STAGE 3 PUBLIC RESPONSE

> STAGE 4 FINAL SHORTLIST FROM THE LEAGUE TABLE

YOUR INPUT TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



#### **STAGE 2 - DROP-IN SESSIONS**

We have arranged four drop-in sessions in the Village Hall Conference Room, enabling you to look at all potential sites and ask questions about each site in more detail and how it is scored using the Site Assessment Matrix.

#### **DATES OF DROP-IN SESSIONS**

#### VILLAGE HALL CONFERENCE ROOM

- > Thu. 8 May, 19:00 21:00
- > Tue. 20 May, 19:00 21:00
- > Sat. 10 May, 10:00 12:00
- > Sat. 31 May, 10:00 12:00

MEMBERS
OF THE
WORKING
GROUP WILL
BE ON HAND
TO ANSWER
QUESTIONS

YOUR INPUT TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



#### **STAGE 3 – YOUR PREFERRED SITES**

Each household will receive a hand-delivered Site Preference Form. The form allows you to grade each site with YES, MAYBE, or NO.

- > YES: You agree that the site is acceptable and could be included in the UPNP.
- > MAYBE: Subject to certain conditions, the site could be included in the UPNP.
- > NO: You are against this site being included in the UPNP.

- > YES will be awarded a score of 4.
- > MAYBE will be awarded a score of 2.
- > NO will be awarded a zero score.

Once all forms have been received and counted, the average public scores for each site will be incorporated within the Matrix to give the final League Table of the sites in order of preference and suitability.

YOUR INPUT TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



#### **STAGE 3 - SELECTING YOUR PREFERRED SITES**

To ensure a fair and unbiased voting system:

- > Each form will be numbered and require you to enter your name and address.
- > Each household member may submit one scoring form.
- > Extra (numbered) forms will be available from the Community Shop
- > Return completed selection forms to the Community Shop or a WG Member. Envelopes are provided for confidentiality.

IT IS
YOUR PLAN
YOUR INPUT &
INVOLVEMENT
IS IMPERATIVE
IN THE
DEVELOPMENT

YOUR INPUT TO SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE SITES



### STAGE 4 – FINAL SELECTION OF PREFERRED SITES

Those sites needed to provide the required 42 dwellings will be selected from those with the highest combined scores AND proposed as the most appropriate sites for inclusion into the UPNP.

- > These sites will then be subject to a Sustainable Environmental Assessment (SEA).
- > All sites must be capable of being serviced by all public infrastructure.
- > WC and the appointed Independent Examiner will also need to approve those sites as acceptable as part of their overall review.
- > Only after all of this will final approval of the proposed sites be given by the Parish residents at the final referendum.

UPNP 2026-2038







**THANK YOU FOR ATTENDING**