

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

LIST OF MAIN MATTERS AND ISSUES (Revised)

Pre-Examination Meeting – 14th JANUARY 2010

Hearing Sessions Commence – 2ND MARCH 2010

Issued: 25th January 2010

Wiltshire Council Local Development Framework South Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination

List of Main Matters, Issues & Participants

Matter 1. Core Policy 1. The Amount of Development.

Question 1.1. Weight to be Given to the Emerging RSS. While the emerging RSS (The Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West Incorporating the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes – for Public Consultation July 2008.) has reached an advanced stage, it has yet to be finalised. What weight, therefore, should be given to the policies in the emerging RSS?

Question 1.2. Amount of Development and the Emerging RSS. In particular, is the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (the CS) correct to base its housing and employment growth figures on Policy HMA11 of the emerging RSS?

Question 1.3. Employment Land. The CS acknowledges that there is a large oversupply of employment land in the area (paragraph 5.46 (f)). Why, therefore is it proposed to make provision for a further 13,900 jobs over the period to 2026?

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863

Savills (Barratt) 812

Brimble Lea & Partners (D Stratton) 2920

Pro Vision Planning and Design 2845

Mr. J. McGarry (Harnham Neighbourhood Association) 1357

Pegasus Planning (Amesbury Property Co) 2881

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Mr. C. Gillham 2900

Ms. J. Guske 2725

Matter 2. Core Policy 1. The Distribution of Development - Settlement Hierarchy.

Question 2.1. Why a Six Tier Settlement Hierarchy? The distribution of development in Policy CS1 is based on a six tier settlement hierarchy. What is the basis for this settlement hierarchy?

Question 2.2. The Choice of Settlements. Have the right settlements been allocated to the right levels in the settlement hierarchy?

Question 2.3. Why Choose this Distribution Strategy? Policy CS1 adopts a strategy of distributing development between various settlements in the South Wiltshire with Salisbury taking the bulk of new housing and employment, a significant amount directed to Amesbury and more modest amounts in other settlements. Why was this strategy

adopted rather than the options of a new settlement or an urban extension as referred to in paragraph 1.9 of the CS?

Question 2.4. Proposed Levels of Growth in Settlements. Broadly speaking, have the right levels of growth been allocated to various settlements?

Question 2.5. Removal of Housing Policy Boundaries. Core Policy 1 states that new development will not be permitted other than in named settlements. The effect of this would be to remove the possibility of infill development, small scale development and redevelopment from a number of villages which previously had housing policy boundaries defined within the Salisbury District Local Plan. What is the justification for this? Why were these particular villages selected as being unsuitable for development?

Participants

Mr. D. Arundale 1675
Teffont Parish Council 3019
Savills (Barratt) 812
Mr. R. C. Weaver 3078
Brimble Lea & Partners (D Stratton) 2920
South West Wiltshire Area Board 2927
WGDP (C. Porter & C. Wapshare) 2729
Pegasus Planning (Longford Estate) 2788
Pegasus Planning (Amesbury Property Co) 2881
Phillips and Co 2910
Terence O'Rourke (JS Bloor / Persimmon) 2800
Godshill PC 2905
Cholderton and District Water Company 455

Matter 3. Core Policy 2. Distribution of Development – Strategic Allocations.

Question 3.1. Strategic Allocations – Why Strategic? Core Policy 2 identifies nine Strategic Allocations which would provide a significant proportion of the housing land to be found in south Wiltshire and much of the employment land. These are Fugglestone Red, Hampton Park, Longhedge (Old Sarum), Churchfields & Engine Sheds, UKLF, South of Netherhampton Road, Central Car Park, Kings Gate Amesbury and the former Imerys Quarry. Are all of these sites truly strategic in the sense that they central to the achievement of the strategy (PPS12 paragraph 4.6)?

Question 3.2. Strategic Allocations –How and Why Selected? What criteria were used in selecting the Strategic Allocations? Why were they selected and alternatives rejected? Are these sites in the most sustainable locations; do they respect local character and the local environment; do they have the best access to local services and employment; and are they otherwise suitable when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?

Question 3.3. Mixed Use and Self Containment. For the most part the Strategic Allocations would be mixed use sites. What evidence is there that this would reduce the number of trips by car, promote self containment?

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863
Highways Agency 2773
Mr. D. Adam 1364
Godshill PC 2905
Savills (Barratt) 812
Salisbury Vision 2901
Pro Vision Planning and Design 2845
Mr. J. McGarry (Harnham Neighbourhood Association) 1357
Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760
Defence Estates 1853 / 2853
English Heritage 1868
Terence O'Rourke (JS Bloor / Persimmon) 2800
Constable Way Residents Association 3015

Matter 4. Core Policy 1. Distribution of Development – Other Sources of Land for Development.

Question 4.1. Suitability of the Saved Local Plan Allocations. The CS relies on allocations saved from the Salisbury District Local Plan to provide some 1594 dwellings and 27.4 ha of employment land. Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?

Question 4.2. Provenance and Suitability of Strategic Areas of Search. The CS refers to 'strategic areas of search' around Salisbury as having the potential to accommodate some 1000 dwellings and 15 ha of employment land. Where are these 'strategic areas of search'? Why are their broad locations not shown on the key diagram? Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS? What is the basis of their selection as being potentially suitable for development?

Question 4.3. Suitability of Salisbury Vision Sites. The CS refers to 'Salisbury Vision' sites as having the potential to accommodate some 800 houses in the longer term. Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?

Question 4.4. Super Garrison. The CS refers to the proposed super garrison. It is unclear at this time what this will involve or where it will be located. However, given the existing and significant military presence in the northern part of the plan area it is

reasonable to assume that part of it will be located in that area. What effect would such a proposal have on the Core Strategies aim of concentrating most housing and employment development at Salisbury?

Question 4.5. Windfalls. Future windfalls are referred to in the CS as a having the potential to supply some 501 housing sites over the period 2020/21 -2025/26. What is the basis for this figure?

Question 4.6. Employment. The emerging RSS acknowledges that there are opportunities for some job growth at locations such as Amesbury but states that the key strategic aim is to extend and enhance Salisbury as an employment and retail centre. Porton Down, Boscombe Down and Solstice Park are all in the Amesbury area and are all allocated for employment in the Salisbury District Local Plan. However while the first two of these locations are treated as saved local plan sites the latter is not. Why is this?

Question 4.7. What provision will be made to promote sustainable transport options in areas, such as Tisbury Community Area, which lie outside Salisbury.

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863

Savills (Barratt) 812

Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport 1598

Ms. J. Guske 2725

Pro Vision Planning and Design 2845

Mr. J. McGarry (Harnham Neighbourhood Association) 1357

Pegasus Planning (Amesbury Property Co) 2881

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Defence Estates 1853 / 2853

Salisbury Vision 2901

Matter 5 – Core Policy 2. Delivery of Development – Strategic Allocations

Question 5.1. Amount and Mix of Development. Would the strategic allocations be capable of delivering the amount and mix of development proposed?

Question 5.2. Frontloading. The CS is based on the frontloading of housing and economic development. In other words the intention is that much of the proposed development would occur in the early years of the plan. What is the justification for this approach?

Question 5.3. Rate of Development. All of the strategic allocations have been selected because of their ability to deliver development in the early years of the plan. How many houses and how much employment land is it anticipated that each of the Strategic

Allocations would yield per year? What evidence is there to suggest that these sites would be able to deliver development at this rate?

Question 5.4. Development Milestones and Phasing. With the exception of the Central Car Park site the intention is that all of the strategic allocations will have been the subject of a planning application within 18 months of the adoption of the CS, that delivery will start within a further 12 months and that thereafter it would proceed in accordance with an agreed phasing plan. How reasonable is this and how feasible? Why is the Central Car Park not subject to such requirements when the housing trajectory appears to show it delivering housing from 2012/2013 onwards? Why is Churchfields the subject of such requirements when the CS acknowledges that it is a longer term project because of its complex nature?

Question 5.5. Transport. An Insurmountable Barrier? The CS states that that there are in, highways and transportation terms, no insurmountable barriers to delivery; that the transport network, with improvements, will be able to support the levels of growth over the plan period; and that it is unlikely that new road building will be required. What is the evidence to support these statements?

Question 5.6. Transport. What, Who and When? What are the highway and transportation measures, or range of potential measures, that would need to be put in place in order to ensure that the transport network would be able to support the Strategic Sites? In developing these sites can congestion and safety problems on the major transport corridors of the A303 and A36 be overcome, can pressure on the Salisbury ring road be accommodated and can meaningful alternative transport choices to the private car be provided? Who would be responsible for financing and implementing any measures that would be required and when would they be implemented?

Question 5.7. Do any Key Strategic Elements of Infrastructure need to be in place before commencement of development? The CS acknowledges that proposed development would need to be supported by the key strategic elements of infrastructure set out in Core Policy 2. However, the gist of paragraph 5.31 is that the implementation of all of the Strategic Allocations and the Saved Local Plan Allocations could start in the short term without awaiting any of the key strategic elements of infrastructure referred to in Core Policy 2. What is the evidence for this?

Question 5.8. Key Strategic Elements of Infrastructure. What, Who and When? What measures are proposed to ensure: that additional pressures on the sewerage network, particularly around Salisbury, be accommodated; that phosphate and pollution levels in local watercourses can be controlled (see also CP 20); that an adequate water supply can be provided to new developments; (See also CP 19); that the additional demand for emergency services, healthcare and school places be dealt with; and that important green infrastructure is provided or retained? Who would be responsible for financing and implementing these various measures and when would they be implemented?

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863
Highways Agency 2773
Mr. D. Adam 1364
Godshill PC 2905
Savills (Barratt) 812
Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport 1598
Pro Vision Planning and Design 2845
Mr. J. McGarry (Harnham Neighbourhood Association) 1357
Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760
Mr. C. Gillham 2900
Natural England 124
Defence Estates 1853 / 2853
Terence O'Rourke (JS Bloor / Persimmon) 2800
Mrs. A. Pheby 2912
Professor D. Pheby 3052
Constable Way Residents Association 3015

Matter 6. Delivery of Development – Other Sources of Supply.

Question 6.1 Delivery of the Saved Local Plan Allocations. The Saved Local Plan Allocations have not been developed in the period since 2003 when the Salisbury District Local Plan was adopted. What evidence is there to indicate that they are likely to be developed over the life of the CS?

Question 6.2. Delivery of Future Strategic Areas of Search. The CS makes clear (paragraph 6.29) that additional work, including discussions with landowners and infrastructure providers, is necessary to prove the deliverability of the strategic areas of search. What progress has been made on this and is there evidence to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect of these areas delivering 1000 or so homes and 15 ha of employment land in the lifetime of the CS?

Question 6.3. Delivery of Salisbury Vision Sites. What evidence is there to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect of the Salisbury Vision sites delivering 800 or so dwellings over the lifetime of the CS?

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863
Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760
Pro Vision Planning and Design 2845
Salisbury Vision 2901

Matter 7. Core Policy 3 - Affordable Housing

Question 7.1. Need. Is there an established need for the affordable housing targets and thresholds contained in Core Policy 3?

Question 7.2. Economic Viability. Are the affordable housing targets and thresholds contained in Core Policy 3 economically viable?

Question 7.3. Flexibility. The sixth bullet point of Core Policy 3 states that the provision of affordable housing will be negotiated on a site by site basis. The first two bullet points of the policy, on the other hand, lay down specific affordable housing requirements. Moreover, throughout the CS there are references to the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing. Is this policy sufficiently flexible, therefore, to meet the changing market conditions that will occur over the life of the CS?

Question 7.4 Basis of Negotiation. What evidence would an applicant have to produce to demonstrate that he or she would not need to provide the specified level and mix of affordable housing for a particular scheme?

Question 7.5. Small Sites Contribution. The fourth bullet point of Core Policy 3 indicates that the level of financial contributions on sites of less than 4 dwellings will be set a Planning Obligations SPD – what opportunity would there be for any independent scrutiny of that level of contribution?

Question 7.6. Regular Review. What would be the nature of the regular review of the need for and type of affordable housing referred to in the final paragraph of Core Policy 3?

Participants

Savills (Barratt) 812

Ms. J. Guske 2725

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Phillips and Co 2910

Matter 8. Provision of Pitches for Gypsies and Travellers

Question 8.1. Strategic Allocations. The CS identifies nine Strategic Allocations which between them will account for bulk of the housing to be found in south Wiltshire in the short term. Given that there is an identified short term need for gypsy and traveller pitches would provision for these be made at the Strategic Allocations?

Question 8.2. Intended Occupants. The first bullet point of Core Policy 4 seeks to control the intended occupants of any pitches. Would these always be known when an

allocation or application was made? Could this matter be dealt with by planning condition?

Question 8.3. In or Close to a Settlement. The second bullet point of Core Policy 4 states that sites should be in or close to a settlement. What are the prospects of finding deliverable sites which meet this criterion?

Question 8.4. Protecting Sites. Given that there is a shortage of Gypsy and Traveller sites should existing such sites be protected from loss to other uses?

Participants

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Matter 9. Core Policies 6, 10, 11, 14, 16 & 17. Housing Needs.

Question 9.1. Core Policies 6, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 17 set out in some detail the size and type of affordable housing and the size of private sector housing that will be needed for the various community areas. What is the evidence base for these policies?

Question 9.2. Has the effect of Core Policies 6, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 17 on the economic viability of schemes been considered?

Question 9.3. Are Core Policies 6, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 17 sufficiently flexible or are they too prescriptive?

Question 9.4. Why is no mention made of housing density?

Participants

Savills (Barratt) 812

Ms. J. Guske 2725

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Matter 10. Core Policy 7. Retail.

Question 10.1. Flexibility. Is Core Policy 7 too prescriptive as to the form of development that will take place at Maltings/Central Car Park?

Question 10.1a Retail Evidence Base. Is the approach and assumptions used to inform the study's findings on retail capacity appropriate? Have the findings been appropriately presented?

Question 10.2 Timing. When is it anticipated that the development at Malting/Central Car Park will take place? Is there a reasonable prospect of this occurring?

Question 10.3. Choice of Sites. Can the need for retail floorspace be met solely at the Maltings/Central Car Park? Does the allocation of Maltings/Central Car Park preclude the development of other retail proposals in appropriate locations which satisfy the objectives of PPS4?

Question 10.4. Salisbury Retail Park. Why is the site at London Road Salisbury (Salisbury Retail Park) not treated as a Saved Local Plan Allocation?

Question 10.5. Policy EC3 of PPS4. In the Salisbury context is it necessary to set floorspace thresholds for the scale of edge of centre and out of centre development which should be subject to an impact assessment? If so what would the geographic areas be?

Participants

Indigo Planning Ltd (Marsh & Baxter Properties) 1821
Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863
Salisbury Vision 2901
Mr. C. Gillham 2900
Mere Parish Council 847

Matter 11. Core Policy 9. Old Sarum Airfield.

Question 11.1. Potential Areas for Development. On what basis were the potential areas for development shown on Map 5 selected. In particular what assessment has been made of the potential effect, positive or negative, that developing these areas would have on the setting of The Old Sarum Airfield Conservation Area, of listed buildings within that area and of the Old Sarum Scheduled Ancient Monument?

Question 11.2. Aircraft Noise. What potential would the development of these sites have to secure some control over the noise of aircraft using the airfield?

Participants

DPDS Consulting Group (Blanefield Property) 1397
English Heritage 1868

Matter 12 Climate Change and the Environment

Question 12.1. Carbon Emissions/Renewable Energy

The CS does not have policies dealing specifically with energy efficiency in buildings; with on site renewable, low carbon and decentralised energy; or with renewable energy/heat. Instead it relies on national and regional targets. Why is this?

Question 12.2. Water Efficiency. Core Policy 19. Core Policy 19 lays down a minimum requirement for water efficiency in new residential developments. This requirement is more onerous than the national requirement. Has the feasibility and viability of this local requirement been tested?

Question 12.3 Phosphate Levels Core Policy 20. The second paragraph of Core Policy 20 refers to the production of a Phosphate Management Plan to be funded by the developers of various sites. Which sites would be required to fund this plan, on what basis would these sites selected, what are the sorts of measures that are likely to be required to ensure that development does not result in the unmitigated addition of phosphates to watercourses?

Question 12.4. Core Policy 23. Green Infrastructure. What is the purpose of the Green Infrastructure Plan which the Council proposes to produce? What is the basis for requiring all developers to contribute towards the implementation of this plan?

Participants

RSPB 2858

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Natural England 124

Terence O'Rourke (JS Bloor / Persimmon) 2800

Matter 13. Other Policies

Question 13.1. Development Management Policies. The CS contains a number of development management policies. These include Core Policy 8 Salisbury Skyline; Core Policy 22 Protection of Services; Core Policy 24 Hotels; and, Core Policy 25 Air Quality. Are these policies essential to the delivery of the Core Strategy?

Question 13.3. Core Policy 18. Lifetime Homes. Has the feasibility and viability of applying this policy to all new dwellings been considered? Is this policy sufficient to ensure that adequate provision will be made for accommodation for the elderly?

Question 13.2. Flood Risk. Core Policy 21. Is Core Policy 21 (Flood Risk) locally distinctive, does it add anything to national or regional policy?

Participants

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Matter 14. Relationship to other DPDs

Question 14.1. The Wiltshire Core Strategy. The Council intends to prepare a core strategy for the whole of Wiltshire. How would the south Wiltshire CS relate to this?

Question 14.2. Site Specific Allocations DPD. The Council intends to prepare a Site Allocations DPD. What policy context does the CS provide for this document? Does the CS strike the right balance between, on the one hand, making clear spatial choices about where development should go and, on the other avoiding being too prescriptive about the type and location of development?

Participants

Bell Cornwell (St. Modwen Properties Plc) 808

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Matter 15. Flexibility/Monitoring

Question 15.1. What Happens If? The CS is very specific about where, how much and what type of development is intended to take place over the life of the CS., particularly in its early years. What contingency plans are in place should this development not take place in the manner anticipated? How would the situation be monitored? What would be the trigger points for implementing any contingency plans?

Participants

Martin Robeson Planning Practice 2863

Highways Agency 2773

Savills (Barratt) 812

Pegasus Planning (Persimmon Homes / Wilton Estate) 2760

Individual Sessions (to be Programmed beyond current timetable)

Amesbury Town Council (128 & 2892) – Representations in General

Mr. G. Jeans (2391) – Parking in relation to Core Policy 10

Mr. L. Lipscombe (2512) – Proposals Map 3b, Netherhampton Road Ridgelines

Pro Vision Planning and Design (383) – Old Sarum Stadium

Appendix 1 South Wiltshire Core Strategy Draft Programme

Please note that morning sessions will run from 10.00am to 1pm and afternoon sessions from 2pm to 5pm, the exception being Friday mornings when the morning session will commence at 09.30 and run through to 1pm.

Week One

DATE	SESSION	MATTER	SUBJECT
March 2nd	AM	1	Core Policy 1. The Amount of Development
March 2nd	PM	2	Core Policy 1. The Distribution of Development - Settlement Hierarchy
March 3rd	AM & PM	4	Core Policy 1. Distribution of Development – Other Sources of Land for Development
March 4th	AM	6	Delivery of Development – Other Sources of Supply
March 4th	PM	8	Provision of Pitches for Gypsies and Travellers
March 5th	AM	7	Core Policy 3 - Affordable Housing

Week Two

DATE	SESSION	MATTER	SUBJECT
March 9 th	AM & PM	10	Core Policy 7 - Retail
March 10 th	AM	9	Core Policies 6, 10, 11, 14, 16 & 17. Housing Needs
March 10 th	PM	12	Climate Change and the Environment
March 11 th	AM	11	Core Policy 9. Old Sarum Airfield
March 11 th	PM	13	Other Policies
March 12 th	AM	14	Relationship to other DPDs

Week Three*

DATE	SESSION	MATTER	SUBJECT
March 23 rd	AM & PM	3 & 5	Matter 3. Core Policy 2. Distribution of Development – Strategic Allocations & Matter 5 – Core Policy 2. Delivery of Development – Strategic Allocations
March 24 th	AM & PM	3 & 5	Matter 3. Core Policy 2. Distribution of Development – Strategic Allocations & Matter 5 – Core Policy 2. Delivery of Development – Strategic Allocations
March 25 th	AM & PM	3 & 5	Matter 3. Core Policy 2. Distribution of Development – Strategic Allocations & Matter 5 – Core Policy 2. Delivery of Development – Strategic Allocations
March 26 th	AM	15	Flexibility/Monitoring

* Please note the Programme for week 3 is likely to be refined once the Inspector has had a chance to assess the statements following the 19th February deadline. Please keep in touch with the Programme Officer or an eye on the website for updates following this date.

Appendix 2 Clarification on Submitting Further Evidence

Please note this guidance should be read in conjunction with paragraphs 8 to 11 of the Pre Hearing Meeting Guidance Notes and the Notes of the Pre Hearing Meeting.

Distinction between Hearing Statements and Amplified Written Statements

Very simply Hearing Statements are further statements to be submitted by those who intend to participate in the Examination as listed above.

Amplified Written Statements are for those representors who wish to produce further information but do not intend to participate orally in the Examination.

All statements must relate to your original representations i.e. if you have not made representations previously on say retail matters you may not do so now. Any further written material submitted whether Hearing Statements or Amplified Written Statements must seek to address the Inspectors questions contained above.

Separate statements should be submitted for each matter to enable effective distribution.

Deadlines

For all matters dealt with in the first two weeks of the Examination the deadline for the submission of hearing statements or amplified written statements is the 5th February 2010.

For all matters to be dealt with beyond week two of the Programme i.e. matters 3, 5, 15 and any further representations representors wish to make in respect of the individual hearing sessions (indicated above) the deadline will be the 19th February 2010.

The deadline for any statements of common ground will also be the 19th February 2010.

Referencing

Hearing Statements should be prefixed with 'HS' and contain details of the submitting organisation / person, the individual representor id and the matter to which the statement relates. Therefore taking the first name on the list under matter 1 the appropriate referencing for the statement would be:

HS / Martin Robeson Planning Practice / 2863 / 1

Amplified Written Statements should follow the same guidelines but be prefixed with AWS rather than HS.

Number of Copies Required.

As all statements will be distributed to other participants it is essential that the correct number of copies are submitted to the Programme Officer to enable swift distribution. Therefore whether you are submitting Hearing Statements or Amplified Written Statements the numbers required are as follows:

Matter 1	12 Copies
Matter 2	13
Matter 3	13
Matter 4	12
Matter 5	14
Matter 6	6
Matter 7	7
Matter 8	4
Matter 9	6
Matter 10	7
Matter 11	4
Matter 12	7
Matter 13	5
Matter 14	6
Matter 15	7

It is also essential that an electronic copy of your submission is sent to the Programme Officer to enable publication on the website and for reference.