Topic Paper 8

Retail




June 2007

SALISBURY DISTRICT LDF
Creating Sustainable Communities

SALISBURY
District Council

LDF Topic Paper - RETAIL

Please note: This topic paper has been updated since originally written to represent the most up to date information at the time of the proposed submission draft.

Executive Summary

A vibrant retail sector

There are very different challenges affecting the different areas of south Wiltshire. There is not just a distinction between rural and urban, but there are different priorities necessary in Salisbury City, Amesbury, Wilton, Tisbury, Mere and Downton and the more rural Hinterland. The more rural areas are dealt with under the Supporting Communities Topic Paper.

National context

The government's planning policy on retail development is set out in PPS6 – Planning for Town Centres. Its main objectives are:

- Promote the vitality and viability of town centres
- Promote, enhance and plan for the growth and development of existing centres
- Enhance consumer choice by making provision for a range of shopping, leisure and local services
- Support efficient, competitive and innovative retail, leisure, tourism and other sectors with improving productivity
- Promote economic growth of regional, sub-regional and local economies
- Deliver more sustainable patterns of development
- Identify the centres where development will be focused, as well as need for new centres of local importance

PPS6 also requires, the core strategy to set out a spatial vision and strategy for the network and hierarchy of centres setting out how the role of different centres will contribute to the overall spatial vision for the area.

When selecting sites for development, local planning authorities, are required, amongst other things to apply the sequential approach to site selection, whilst also assessing the need and impact of the development, identifying appropriate scale of any development as well as ensuring locations are accessible and well service by a choice of means of transport. New development on specific sites should not however be considered in isolation from the rest of the city centre

Local authorities are also required to seek to retain and enhance existing markets through investing in their improvement and where appropriate re-introduce or create new ones.

Regional Context

The draft RSS identifies Salisbury as a Strategically Significant City and Town (SSCT) it recognizes that the SSCT's should be the main focus for investment in retail and other major facilities requiring high levels of accessibility. The RSS also requires the range and quality of central area facilities of market towns be enhanced. The RSS also emphasizes that out of town retail development should be resisted.

County context

The structure plan identifies that employment, shopping, leisure and other service uses which attract large numbers of people should be concentrated at existing town centres.

Local context: Salisbury City
Salisbury city is the biggest retail centre in south Wiltshire and draws shoppers from a very wide area. A successful shopping centre is important to the City, and to the economy of the District as a whole. The council is keen to maintain its success and its attractiveness.

A retail and leisure needs study has been undertaken for south Wiltshire by an external consultant, GVA Grimley, a copy of the main report can be found on the Council's website. The study identifies specific floorspace requirements until 2021. It projects that Salisbury city centre needs to provide for the following comparison shopping net floor area up until this time:

Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Salisbury City	5,031	13,346	22,970

GVA Grimley has carried out an independent review of proposals for retail development in south Wiltshire (Review of Salisbury Retail Proposals, 2007). Related to Salisbury, the independent review concludes "We are satisfied that there is a general need for additional comparison i.e. non food and shopping floorspace in Salisbury over and above the amount of floorspace permitted by the extant London Road retail warehouse consent. However, GVA Grimley have not identified any specific quantitative or qualitative need for additional retail warehouse development in the Salisbury area, over and above the existing extensive provision and the committed proposals, which are reflected in the adopted local plan."

This study also tells us that a number of shops would like more floorspace and new retailers wish to come to Salisbury, however there aren't the shop units available of the size required, also the vacancy rate is low. If we keep Salisbury as it is, without change, it will fall behind other retail centres that we currently compete with such as Southampton, Bournemouth and Bath. This will result in the quality of Salisbury's retail offer diminishing and all retailers will suffer.

It is often not appropriate to convert the smaller shops into larger units because of the unavailability of units and more importantly because this could harm the important historic character of the City Centre. So the only way to provide larger and more shops is to build more.

Salisbury is in a fortunate position to have available land in the city centre at the site of the Central Car Park, and this site could be redeveloped in order to provide for the identified need, potentially through a mixed-use development, whilst also maintaining car parking which is important to maintain for retail development. This proposal backed up by the Salisbury vision. Salt Lane car park, Brown street car park and the bus station could also be made available for retail development.

The study also identifies that any retail development needs to be managed carefully as Salisbury cities retail economy is characterised importantly by an abundance of Niche retailers and a lot of shoppers come to Salisbury for this reason, the needs of these retailers therefore also need to be managed. This could be managed through the maintenance of the City Centre Boundary, Primary and Secondary shopping are frontages that already exist, albeit slightly amended and the designation of Fisherton Street as a Special Policy Area to enhance the niche retailing in this area and its attractiveness to users and retailers.

With respect to convenience floorspace it has been identified that Salisbury is quite well provided and of the period to 2021 the following floorspace requirement is needed:

Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Salisbury City	262	1,178	2,145

This could potentially again be provided for on the Central car park site, which represents a sequentially preferable location.

GVA Grimley has carried out an independent review of proposals for retail development in the south Wiltshire (Review of Salisbury Retail Proposals, 2007), as a result of various planning applications. It states “ We consider that, based on the Retail and Leisure Needs Study, there is some limited capacity for additional convenience shopping floorspace in the Salisbury area… although we do not consider there is any clear cut quantitative or qualitative need given the extensive existing range of services within the area.

The Salisbury vision further identifies that the Southampton Road area of Salisbury should be redeveloped to create an attractive ‘Eastern Gateway’ as currently the road creates an unwelcoming introduction to our city. It is therefore suggested that the area could be redeveloped to create a new mixed use quarter, however this could result in a loss of 3.86 hectares of retail land, which increases the need for more comparison retail space beyond that already identified. If this proposal was to go forward.

QUESTIONS

- Without investment in the city centre and the addition of new format retail units Salisbury City centre will experience decline. Should the council build new mixed-use development including retail units on the central car park in order to meet the identified shopping need, which could be anchored by a new supermarket?
- If there is additional retail need on top of what is identified where should it go?
- We feel that the existing town centre and frontage boundaries in Salisbury should remain as they focus retail services, do you agree?

Local context: Amesbury

The Retail and Leisure needs study also looked into retail provision in Amesbury and identified a relatively healthy town centre which has experienced investment in recent years. Amesbury performs a more local shopping function. The centre also has a monthly market. The consultants concluded that the retail composition in the centre is consistent with expectations, however we are told from discussions with local people that since the new Co-op opened in the town centre that individual retailers in Amesbury have started to struggle.

Some people tell us that in order to resolve the situation, Amesbury needs a new supermarket. However the retail and leisure needs study tells us that the following convenience floorspace capacity is needed in Amesbury up until 2021:

Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Amesbury Town Centre	-131	-29	78

In response to whether there is a need for an additional foodstore in Amesbury, GVA Grimley were instructed to carry out a review of foodstore proposals in Amesbury. It concluded “If the former Co-op store in Amesbury Town Centre were to be reoccupied in its entirety by a replacement operator, achieving a comparable turnover to the Co-op, this would largely address the quantitative need at 2011 based on current market shares. This would also reinforce the overall conclusion reached in the Retail, Leisure and Need Study i.e. that there is no clearly defined need within Amesbury over and above identified commitments i.e. the Co-op based on constant market shares”. The report goes on to state “In the event that the former Co-op store is not reoccupied in its entirety by a replacement convenience retailer achieving this level of turnover, we consider there will be a notional surplus capacity arising based on constant market shares.” Therefore in overall terms GVA Grimley states “We are satisfied that if the former Co-op store is not reoccupied or is only partly reoccupied by a convenience retailer, the analysis presents evidence of a quantitative need”.

Based on the above conclusion, GVA Grimley recommended that the council investigate the current situation with the Co-op regarding the availability of the unit, and establish whether there is any realistic prospect of reoccupation of the entire unit by an alternative convenience retailer.

Even if there was predicted floorspace capacity, there are no ‘in centre’ or ‘edge of centre’ sites within Amesbury, as defined by government planning statements. Our consultants have undertaken some modelling work for us and tested the impact that a supermarket of 1,800 sq m net and 2,500 sq m net would have on Amesbury. Their work concluded that such supermarkets would have a 33.2% and 37% impact on the town centre, taking trade away. We are therefore advised to take a cautious approach to any out of centre convenience provision in Amesbury as any new foodstore located outside the town centre will have a detrimental impact on the health of Amesbury Town Centre.

With respect to comparison goods capacity, the following floorspace is projected:

Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Amesbury Town Centre	117	253	408

This capacity could be provided for in time in the Town Centre if required.

GVA Grimley recommended that Amesbury should continue to be defined as a Town Centre and that the town centre boundary and designation of retail frontages. However the new use class order 2006 could also be used to allow a certain level of A3 quality restaurant and cafe uses, while preventing undesirable drinking establishments and hot food takeaways in certain locations. We could use this by encouraging A1 shop use in the primary frontages whilst managing a more flexible representation in secondary shopping frontages. For example restrict the A5 uses (hot food take-away) whilst encouraging A3 use (restaurants and cafes).

QUESTIONS:

- An out of town supermarket could kill Amesbury Town Centre. We see Amesbury as functioning as a key service centre, do you wish to maintain this?
- Should the council use their CPO powers to build a site for a new supermarket in the existing town centre even though this could take some years?
- Should the council continue to have a town centre boundary and retail frontage to be used to encourage certain uses in different areas and should these be amended, if so where?
- What kind of uses should be encouraged in the town centre?
- What kind of uses should be encouraged in the primary shopping frontages?

Local context: Other centres

The Retail and Leisure needs survey identified that the smaller centres of Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton are vital and viable shopping and service destinations as well as performing as local village centres offering not more than essential everyday requirements to a local catchment. Vacancy rates are particularly low in every centre. These should therefore be identified as a network of local centres that are meeting day-to-day needs.

Wilton is the largest and busiest centre offering the greatest range of comparison units together with a weekly market, however although appearing healthy, several shop units have recently been granted planning consent for conversion to residential uses. If this trend continues, the health of the centre will decline and will eventually not meet the key service and shopping requirements of the local population. Tisbury and Downton appeared to be the most rural and quiet villages; Mere is an attractive and vibrant centre with good pedestrian footfall. Although the loss of shop units has not yet been experienced in other centres apart from Wilton, this could the beginning of local centre decline generally.

In order to try and help the centres were are advised that a policy should be developed that could ensure the network of local centres continues to provide easily accessible shopping to meet people's day to day needs and to also encourage these centres to provide other facilities such as health centres and community facilities. Any mix of uses should be carefully managed especially the change of use of existing buildings, a 'commercial strip' policy could be introduced to protect A1 (retail) uses and other important services. The new use class order can also be used to restrict A5 use (hot food take away), which could help to maintain the quality of an area. Without such policies the centres might erode and undermine the overall health of the centres.

Beyond this the community strategies are also telling us other requirements. In the Stonehenge area it is suggested that support should be made for the Durrington local centre. The council could identify this as part of the network of local centres that with and identified 'commercial strip' could help to make the centre more viable. It has also be identified that residential and office use should be allowed above ground floor retail, which could be controlled through frontage policies and that existing markets should be enhanced and maintained.

QUESTIONS?

- Should the council implement a policy to ensure the network of smaller centres (Tisbury, Downton, Wilton and Mere) are maintained?
- Should 'commercial strips' be introduced to the local centres to protect the retail use and other important services whilst also allowing offices and residential above
- Should the local centre in Durrington be identified and shopping frontages be designated in order to protect the retail use?
- Should the markets be enhanced and how could this be achieved?

LDF Topic Paper

RETAIL

Issues and Options Summary

Salisbury

- Make provision for a range of shopping to support an efficient, competitive and innovative retail sector
- Take opportunities to enhance and strengthen Salisbury as a retail centre through providing for department stores, higher order and mainstream retailers
- Provide new retail units whilst protecting and enhancing the historic environment, tourism economy and the differential and specialist retail offer in Salisbury
- Provide for identified convenience floorspace requirements of (sq m net) 252 by 2011, 1,178 by 2016 and 2,145 by 2021.
- Provide for identified comparison floorspace requirements of (sq m net) 5,031 by 2011, 13,346 by 2016 and 22,970 by 2021.
- Do not provide for any further out of centre foodstore development
- Maintain the city centre boundary, primary and secondary frontages
- Designate Fisherton Street as a Special Policy Area
- Redevelop the Maltings and Central Car park for a mix of uses including retail, anchored by a new food superstore
- Redevelop Southampton Road and create a new mixed use quarter resulting in a loss of 3.86ha of retail land
- Redevelop Salt Lane, Brown Street Car parks and the Bus station to include some retail

Amesbury

- There is no need to allocate a new supermarket in Amesbury due to lack of projected need.
- Provide for a new supermarket in Amesbury
- Provide new comparison floorspace in line with projections of (sq m net): 117 by 2011, 253 by 2016 and 408 by 2021.
- Amesbury town secondary shopping area should be extended to incorporate the area covered by the new Co-op site (allocation S8)
- Need to encourage more A1 (retail) use in primary frontages
- Encourage more A3 (Restaurant and café) use in the secondary shopping area of Amesbury
- Discourage A5 (hot food takeaway) use in the secondary shopping area of Amesbury
- Provide for better shopping and support for Amesbury and Durrington centres

Other centres

- Durrington, Wilton, Downton, Tisbury and Mere should be identified as a network of local centres that are easily accessible and provides shopping to meet day to day needs.
- Within the local centres designate primary frontages in order to resist change from retail
- Use other frontage policies in order to resist change from retail (A1)
- Restrict undesirable take-away’s in the core areas
- Provide a link between Wilton’s shopping centre and the centre of the village
- Support trade and business in Mere
- Enhance retail units in Downton
- Allow residential or office above ground floor retail
- Retain and enhance existing markets and re-introduce or create new ones.

CONTENTS

1. Issues facing Salisbury District

2. The National and Regional Policy Background

   a. National Planning Policy
   b. Regional Spatial Strategy

3. Linking it Together – what do existing Local Strategies say?

4. Priorities at community level.

5. Learning from Experience

6. Key Issues and Spatial Patterns

7. Options

8. Initial Consultation

9. Bibliography

INTRODUCTION

This Topic Paper seeks to explain the council's approach towards new retail provision, in particular in Salisbury, Amesbury, Mere, Downton, Tisbury, Wilton and Durrington and the basis on which a major new retail development is being proposed for inclusion in the Local Development Framework.

The central objective to Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) is to promote the vitality and viability of town centres by planning for the growth of existing centres, through expansion of existing boundaries if necessary, and enhancing existing centres by promoting them as the focus for new development. New planning regulations now control the development of internal mezzanine floorspace, and the Use classes Order has recently been revised to enable local authorities to manage uses more effectively, thus protecting the vitality and viability of town centres.

The draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy identifies no retail hierarchy and instead designates 23 Strategically Significant Cities and Towns (SSCT's), Salisbury is among this list. More specifically Salisbury is identified as an important employment, tourism and retail centre.

1. ISSUES FACING SALISBURY DISTRICT

1.0 Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment (GVA Grimley – 2006)

In June 2006, GVA Grimley were commissioned by Salisbury District Council to undertake a Retail and Leisure Needs Study for Salisbury district in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres.

1.2 The appointed consultant was expected to carry out a retail and leisure needs assessment in accordance with the methodology set out in the brief provided and PPS6. The work was split into two categories retail and leisure. The study was required to cover the following facilities in urban and rural areas:

Convenience shopping - including supermarkets, superstores and smaller local outlets.
Comparison shopping - including retail warehouses, retail parks, warehouse clubs, factory outlet centres, regional and sub-regional shopping centres.
Leisure - including cinemas, indoor bowling centres, night clubs, restaurant, bars and fast food outlets, bingo halls and health and fitness centres.

1.3 The area of study identified was Salisbury City with a subsidiary study looking at retail and leisure need in Amesbury. The consultants were also required to look at the key rural villages of Tisbury, Mere, Wilton and Downton.

1.4 The consultants were required to undertake both quantitative and qualitative need for new retail and leisure floorspace and facilities. Whilst quantitative need takes precedence as the key driver for assessing the level of future retail floorspace needed, qualitative need is also an important aspect of overall need. The assessment of quantitative need for further retail development was based on the catchment area of the retail centres. This catchment extends substantially further than the boundaries of Salisbury District itself.

The remainder of the section now details the findings within the retail study produced by GVA Grimley.

1.5 What are the national retail trends?

The key national trends in retailing and service provision is drawn by GVA Grimley from a range of published data sources including research by Verdict Analysis, Mintel and the New Economics Foundation.

1.6 National retail trends indicate a continued growth in incomes and expenditure, albeit not at such strong levels as in the last 15-20 years. The growth in expenditure is focused on comparison goods with virtually no increase in convenience goods expenditure.

1.7 Increased car ownership has resulted in greater household mobility and therefore the choices for shopping centres to visit and the distances that can be traveled are much greater. Internet shopping has grown phenomenally in the last few years and looks set to continue in certain sectors.

1.8 The foodstore operators have continued to evolve their formats and offer. With restrictions on out-of-centre stores growing, and changing socio-economic trends, several large operators have returned to the high street with small convenience stores. Operators are also seeking to extend their comparison goods offer, turning stores into variety or mini department stores. This trend in out-of-centre locations could pose a threat to smaller centres, where the large out-of-centre stores become one stop shopping destinations negating trips to the town centres.

1.9 There has been a continued polarisation towards larger centres and the provision of larger stores in these larger centres. Where smaller centres have been unable to diversify their offer or create niche markets they have suffered. The focus on urban renewal has increased demand for town centre sites for a wider range of land uses.

1.10 Since the mid-90s, despite higher rents, there has been a steady trend, driven by central government policy, towards building new leisure schemes in town/edge of centre locations. Mixed-use retail and leisure development has proved to be a real growth area in town centres. These trends present significant opportunities and challenges to Salisbury's centres and in particular Salisbury. The centre is well placed to benefit from forecast spending growth but it needs to adapt if it is to capitalise on these opportunities, and maintain and enhance its position within the wider region.

1.11 Sub-regional context

The sub-regional context in retailing and service provision is drawn by GVA Grimley from a range of published data sources including research the Household Telephone Survey undertaken as part of the study, PROMIS, Javelin Venuescore Ranking, Focus Property Intelligence database and Egi. Discussions were also had by GVA Grimley with each of the local authorities to clarify the position regarding development in the pipeline.

1.12 The Household Telephone Survey undertaken as part of the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study identified Southampton, Bath, Trowbridge, Swindon, Yeovil, Andover, Poole and Bournemouth as the key competing centres. It is clear that Southampton is the greatest threat given its trade draw, scale and quality of retail offer, rents, proximity, rank position and major development opportunities coming forward over the forthcoming LDF period. Southampton, Bath and Bournemouth are stronger than Salisbury in terms of retail space, Prime Zone A Retail Rents and retailer demand for space, although trade draw to Bath and Bournemouth is more limited given their distance from Salisbury.

1.13 Salisbury therefore appears to sit between the stronger and weaker centres in the sub-region, which could be a vulnerable position over the LDF period, particularly as competing centres continue to implement major improvements to their town centres. Salisbury is not, however, far behind the stronger centres, and Javelin Venuescore Ranking actually ranks Salisbury marginally higher than Swindon and Bournemouth based on mix of retailer.

1.14 In a ‘do-nothing’ scenario Salisbury will fall further behind the larger stronger centres, and it is crucial for Salisbury to encourage investment and new retailers. It will be equally as crucial for Salisbury not to focus solely on new format retail development, and any town centre development should happen in conjunction with protecting and enhancing the historic environment, tourist economy and differential/specialist retail offer. Shoppers and visitors come to Salisbury for a variety of reasons, not just shopping which other competing centres rely upon. Salisbury should retain its recognized identity.

1.15 Salisbury City Centre: Health Check
Salisbury is an attractive and historic city, with a high quality environment, and a strong representation of small, specialist shops. It performs a role not only as a retail destination, but is also a strong tourist and visitor destination, as well as an important employment centre.

1.15 Analysis within the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study identifies a vital and viable town centre. The number of comparison outlets is above the national average, the proportion of vacant units is well below the national average, rents have risen in recent years, yields have remained static and demand from retailers for space has increased. The city centre has a good mix of leisure activities including a cinema, nightclub, bingo hall, health & fitness club and a theatre. According to data recorded by Salisbury City Centre Management, pedestrian footfall has increased across the centre and overall figures have fallen. Shoppers particularly like the environment, the range of well-known/multiple retailers and good selection of independent and specialist stores.

1.17 The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure needs assessment has identified potential signs of vulnerability and barriers to growth, as well as opportunities to enhance and strengthen the centre over the forthcoming LDF period. The street pattern is complex and extensive, and pedestrian circulation is unlikely to penetrate all quarters, particularly by those who are unfamiliar with the centre. There are a number of key attractors missing, including department stores, and higher order and mainstream retailers that are represented in competing centres such as Southampton. The proportion of menswear units is below the national average.

1.18 Retailer demand has risen, but the quality of requirements is not sufficient to fill the gaps in provision. Developments in the pipeline will, however, stimulate demand, and the GVA Grimley study considers that Salisbury would be a destination of choice for a number of retailers if the opportunity arose. Vacancy rates are below the national average, but this represents a barrier to growth, i.e. there is no space for new retailers to enhance provision. At present, and as identified by the In Centre survey undertaken as part of the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs study that Salisbury is not a first choice shopping destination for a number of shoppers who instead choose to visit competing centres such as Southampton. Without new development in Salisbury, this position will only be exacerbated over the LDF period, as competing centres continue to improve and implement proposals in the pipeline. Our analysis has also identified a weak usage of the centre in the evenings.

1.19 Local Centres: Health Checks
Overall, the small centres in the District form attractive and traditional towns and villages, and the quality of the environment is excellent in each. Data for local centre health checks is drawn from appendix 3 of the Retail and Leisure Needs Study together with site visits by the consultant.

1.20 Amesbury
The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs assessment has identified that Amesbury has a relatively healthy town centre, which has experienced substantial investment in recent years. In particular, a replacement Co-Op store was under construction at the time of the study, which has now opened and an attractive mixed use residential and retail scheme has been completed on the junction of High Street and London Road. The retail composition in the centre is consistent with GVA Grimley's expectations of a centre performing a more local shopping function, i.e. the proportion of convenience and service retailers is above average, while the proportion of comparison units is below. The centre has a monthly market and vacancy rates are significantly below national average levels.

1.21 Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton all perform well as local village centres offering no more than essential 'everyday' requirements to a local catchment. Each centre has a Post Office, pharmacy and local top-up foodstore. Vacancy rates are particularly low in every centre. Wilton is the largest and busiest centre offering the greatest range of comparison units as well as a weekly market on a Thursday. Tisbury and Downton appeared the most rural and quiet villages with little through traffic, and Mere is an attractive and vibrant centre with good pedestrian footfall. Each centre performs a local shopping function, and they do not appear vulnerable in the current circumstances. It is also apparent that growth is also unlikely over the forthcoming LDF period given their current function and built environment.

1.22 GVA Grimley's assessment suggests that Wilton is a relatively healthy village centre, performing well in the key vitality and viability indicators. It does not, however, reflect trendline information that a number of shop units have recently been granted planning consent for conversion to residential uses, and the quality and range of goods could perhaps be improved. If this trend continues, the health of the centre will decline and it will not meet the key service and shopping requirements of the local population.

1.23 Out of Centre Retail Provision
Salisbury has two main edge/out-of-town foodstores. The Tesco store is trading well, and is modern in format and appearance. An extension was under construction at the time of the GVA Grimley retail and leisure needs study, which will broaden the range of non-food goods, although the proportion is conditioned in the consent. A further application (Ref: S/2006/1740) has been submitted to amend the extension floorspace, resulting in a small net decrease in additional sales floorspace. Waitrose 'Home and Food' is also modern in format and appearance and was busy on the day of the site visit. Referred to as edge-of-centre, the store sells a strong range of non-food 'homeware' products.

1.24 The main concentration of retail warehousing in the District is dispersed along Southampton Road to the south east of Salisbury City Centre. There is no dominant retail park in Salisbury, and instead retailers are located on freestanding sites or small groupings. A former MFI unit on the Dolphin Retail Park and a unit adjacent to Waitrose are currently vacant. There is one commitment for additional bulky goods retail warehousing on a site on London Road.

1.25 Capacity Projections
The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure impact study provide capacity projections. The section draws from data provided by the Experian e-marketer in-house system and indicates that the total population of the survey area is forecast to grow from 561,987 in 2006 to 634,305 in 2021 - a strong increase of 13%. As a result convenience goods expenditure is expected to increase from £890.7m in 2006 to £1,115m by 2021. In the comparison sector, higher growth rates illustrate that spending will increase from £1,635m in 2006 to £3,469m in 2021 – an overall increase of £1,834m (or 112%).

1.25 The GVA Grimley Retail Needs and Leisure Study 2006 indicated residual capacity to support additional retail floorspace over the forthcoming LDF period. These baseline capacity figures are illustrated in Tables 1-4 for convenience and comparison goods. They highlighted capacity to supposed additional floorspace based on current market shares, and have taken into consideration commitments. If new development proposals come forward above these levels, the issue of claw back (i.e. increasing market share) would need to be taken into consideration.

Table 1: Convenience Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (£000)			
Area	2011 (£000)	2016 (£000)	2021 (£000)
Total District	15,165	26,229	37,901
Salisbury City Centre	2,616	11,780	21,449
Amesbury Town Centre	-1,307	-295	781

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

Table 2: Convenience Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	1,516	2,623	3,790
Salisbury City Centre	262	1,178	2,145
Amesbury Town Centre	-131	-29	78

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

Table 3 Comparison Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (£000)			
Area	2011 (£000)	2016 (£000)	2021 (£000)
Total District	55,752	150,771	282,136
Salisbury City Centre	33,327	97,616	185,490
Amesbury Town Centre	582	1,386	2,469

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

Table 4 Comparison Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	9,181	22,488	38,115
Salisbury City Centre	5,031	13,346	22,970
Amesbury Town Centre	117	253	408

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

1.26 Scope for New Development and Recommendations

1.27 Salisbury City Centre

The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs In terms of quantitative and qualitative analysis identify that in a 'do-nothing' scenario Salisbury will fall further behind the larger stronger centres, and it is crucial for Salisbury to encourage investment and new retailers. It is advised that it is equally as crucial for any town centre development to happen in conjunction with protecting and enhancing the historic environment, tourist economy and differential/specialist retail offer. Protecting and enhancing the city's identity is equally as crucial as attracting new investment in order to maintain its higher order position in the sub-regional retail hierarchy.

1.28 Convenience Goods

In terms of convenience goods, the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study 2006 has highlighted reasonably good foodstore provision in the town centre. This includes the large format J Sainsbury's in the Maltings, and the Tesco Metro and Marks & Spencer foodhall. The qualitative assessment identified that the J Sainsbury was relatively quiet, and the Tesco Metro and M&S were both busy. We consider this may have been a consequence of the timing of the site visit, i.e. in the middle of a weekday. J Sainsbury may be busier during the evenings and weekends when shoppers are undertaking their main food shopping trip, although it did appear that the store was not performing as well as comparable stores elsewhere in the sub-region and UK that are of a similar scale.

1.29 The quantitative analysis supports the qualitative findings. The results suggest that J Sainsbury is performing in line with estimated company averages, and Tesco and M&S are performing marginally below expected trading levels. Nevertheless, we would expect a store the size of J Sainsbury, in a city centre location with ample parking, to be trading considerably better than identified in our qualitative and quantitative assessment. This may partly be a consequence of the difficulties of access to the first floor location of the current supermarket site.

1.30 Nearby, the Tesco on Southampton Road is trading well, and the Waitrose on Churchill Way is trading marginally above expecting company averages. Based on the current performance of city centre and out-of-centre convenience goods floorspace, within the city's urban area, the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Study 2006 has identified capacity for 262 sq m net of additional convenience goods floorspace during the period to 2011. The figures indicate that there will be capacity for an additional 1,178 sq m net by 2016, and 2,145 sq m net by 2021.

1.31 Tesco's on Southampton Road has recently submitted a planning application to revise the scheme currently under construction (Ref: S/06/1740). This involves a net reduction in retail floorspace and as a consequence the proposals have already met the key policy tests.

1.32 The Maltings site is regarded as the primary retail development site for Salisbury in the Adopted Local Plan and remains a City Centre retail site in the Replacement Local Plan. The Planning Brief published in January 2001 recognises that the Maltings is crucial to the vitality and viability of Salisbury City Centre and its continued success as a retail, entertainment, employment, tourist and residential centre, is to a large extent dependent on the levels of attractiveness of the Maltings area to shoppers and visitors to the city centre.

1.33 Planning consent was subsequently granted in June 2003 (Ref: S/2002/0802) for the redevelopment of The Maltings. Whilst planning permission has been granted to redevelop the Maltings, agreement has yet to be reached on the terms of the Section 106 Agreement and land ownership issues. If the current proposal is not implemented as approved, the Council, at a meeting of Cabinet earlier this year, has indicated that it is still committed to the redevelopment of The Maltings including a larger foodstore. The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study advises that the Council should maintain this objective over the forthcoming LDF period and be particularly cautious in terms of new out-of-centre foodstore proposals and extensions given the negligible identified capacity. The cumulative effect of city centre and out-of-centre development is likely to result in unacceptable impact on the network of centres in the district.

1.34 Comparison Goods

Driven by a strong forecast growth in retail expenditure and growing competition in the wider sub region, the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study considers that there is potential to increase, improve and consolidate comparison goods retail floorspace in Salisbury City Centre. In particular, there is a need to bring forward development proposals to stimulate demand from higher order, mainstream and quality comparison goods retailers to fill the gaps in provision. This will be important if Salisbury is to maintain its position as a higher order centre in the sub-regional hierarchy as envisaged in the RSS.

1.35 Capacity projections identify capacity for additional comparison goods floorspace in Salisbury City Centre over the forthcoming LDF period. On the basis it is able to maintain market share in the face of growing competition the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs assessment estimates capacity for circa 5,031 sq m net of comparison goods floorspace by 2009, 13,346 sq m net by 2011 and 22,970 sq m net by 2021.

1.36 At present, Salisbury retains circa 15% of total available comparison goods expenditure within the survey area. The remaining trade is being directed towards the competing centres in the wider sub Salisbury region and out-of-centre retail warehousing. Following implementation of town centre schemes in competing centres, it is possible that Salisbury's market share could erode as shoppers change their centre of preference. It will be important for Salisbury to enhance and consolidate its role to prevent such an outcome.

1.37 It is evident that Salisbury City Centre has a number of different shopping areas, both primary and secondary, which also vary in footfall and character quite significantly. The centre varies from the historical central streets of Butcher Row and Ox Row, the more modern Maltings development to the west of the centre, The Old George Mall shopping centre in the south west of the centre, The Cross Keys Mall adjacent to the Market Place, and independent character streets such as Fisherton Street, Castle Street, Winchester Street and Milford Street. The challenge over the forthcoming LDF period will be to implement new development to suit the requirements of modern format retailers, while maintaining the cohesion of the centre and quality of these different character areas.

1.38 The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study advises that work commissioned by the local authority to review potential development opportunities in more detail should not consider 'stand alone' sites, and should review the city centre boundary as a whole and the implications of development in one area on other areas. Area Action Plans can be effective means with which to consider the future of town and city centres as a whole, and covers issues such as transport/accessibility, car parking, linkages and connectivity, as well development opportunities in more detail. Any further work should be underpinned by a requirement to maintain the city's historic identity, protect independent and specialist retailers, and enhance the quality of the built environment. This is crucial to maintain its differentiation from competing centres in the sub-region.

1.39 GVA Grimley consider that the city centre boundary remains appropriate over the forthcoming LDF period, and primary and secondary retail frontages should be maintained. Within policy formulation, the council should take advantage to recent changes in the Use Classes Order which has introduced a more detailed hierarchy of 'A retail uses' in order to control the introduction of hot food takeaways and drinking establishments.

1.40 Given its special character and range and choice of specialist and independent shops, GVA Grimley recommend that consideration be given to designating Fisherton Street as a special policy area to protect existing uses, to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment and prevent the introduction of inappropriate hot food takeaways.

1.41 GVA Grimley have identified a number of sites/areas in the city centre that have the potential to accommodate development or redevelopment which would contribute to meeting Salisbury's long term comparison shopping and other needs. The future of these areas and implementation of schemes warrants detailed consideration given the limited nature of available sites to expand/enhance the city centre, and these development opportunity areas should not be wasted in light of growing competition in the wider sub-region. Any schemes which compromise an optimum solution, in terms of poor linkages and piecemeal development should be strongly resisted.

1.42 The overall objectives over the LDF period should be to enhance city centre foodstore provision, enhance the evening economy, introduce space for higher order and quality retailer, maintain the range of independent and specialist retailers, protect the city's identity and embrace the historic fabric and built environment, and ensure that any new development is of an appropriate scale and design to complement the existing city centre. Sites considered suitable for development in Salisbury City Centre include the following:-

- The Maltings
- Brown Street Car Park
- Salt Lane Car Park
- Wiltshire and Dorset Bus Station
- Land Bound by Scots Lane and Blue Boar Row

1.43 The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study advises that Salisbury should be promoted as the main focus for retail and leisure activity over the forthcoming LDF period. New development on specific sites should not, however, be considered in isolation from the rest of the city centre. Linkages and integration of different sites and schemes should underpin the future of the city centre, and one option to achieve this comprehensive approach is an Area Action Plan. This approach will consider all of the key issues comprehensively, including transport/accessibility, pedestrian circulation and connectivity, linkages and signage and development opportunity sites.

1.44 Additional advice with regard to Salisbury City since the Retail and Leisure Needs study was completed:

In addition in June 2007 it was queried that in appendix 6, table 20 the line ‘sales from committed floorspace £000)’ the 2011 figure is 13,027, 2016 is 13,557 and 2021 is 14108. These figures are the same as within the previous two tables for Salisbury city (table 19 and the district (table 18), however it was queried whether the Salisbury figures should infact be less. GVA Grimley concluded that it was reasonable to strip out the Tesco commitment (extension to Tesco, Southampton Road, Salisbury, from the ‘Amesbury Urban Area’ capacity Table (table 20). This results in capacity in Amesbury for 969sq m net of convenience goods floorspace – based on current market share and in reality this will decline once the Tesco commitment opens leading to a fall in capacity. The Tesco extension will draw some trade away from Amesbury’s urban area.

1.45 Since the production of the Retail Topic Paper the Council has received a number of applications for both new convenience and comparison retail floorspace in the Salisbury area. Due to this GVA Grimley, who produced the Retail and Leisure Needs Study (RLNS), were asked to carry out an independent review of proposals for retail development in the Salisbury District (Review of Salisbury Retail Proposals, 2007).

1.46 Discount convenience floorspace in Salisbury

In November 2007 GVA Grimley were asked for retail advice with respect to convenience floorspace and possible proposals for a discount out-of-town convenience retailer with 1,640 sq m of additional floorspace. The report states “ We consider that, based on the Retail and Leisure Needs Study, there is some limited capacity for additional convenience shopping floorspace in the Salisbury area although we do not consider there is any clear cut quantitative or qualitative need given the extensive existing range of services within the area. Any application would need to be supported by a comprehensive assessment of alternative sites. We anticipate this may conclude that a number of smaller sites in the centre are not suitable, viable or available. However, we consider the Maltings represents the key central opportunity to accommodate additional convenience and comparison shopping floorspace in Salisbury, and represents a sequentially preferable location in which to accommodate any identified need.”

1.47 Subsequently two applications for discount retailers have been received (S/2008/550 and S/2008/1389) these are both for out of town convenience retailers. Further advice has been sort from GVA Grimley which concluded:

‘There is identified quantitative and qualitative need for a discount foodstore. There may be sufficient quantitative capacity to support both proposals ovr the next 3-4 years, although this is to some extent subject to the scale of development permitted in Amesbury (see further on in this Topic Paper). Whilst two stores would provide additional employment and local regeneration, the qualitative case for a second store in this location is less compelling. A discount foodstore as proposed is of an appropriate sale in this location. However the provision of two similar stores in such close proximity would not provide a particularly sustainable distribution of convenience facilities serving the Salisbury catchment. We consider it would be more appropriate in terms of scale to seek a better distribution of stores relative to local needs. We do not consider either proposal is likely to have any adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre in itself. If both applications were permitted and able to secure operators, we consider they would impact on each other and on the nearby Tesco, and their combined impact on the city centre would not be likely to undermine its vitality and viability. However, both the need for, and impact of the proposal will be to some extent influenced by the outcome of the call in inquiry into current proposals for Amesbury.

1.48 Salisbury Retail Park

GVA Grimley also advised upon application S/2007/1460 – Salisbury Retail Park. This application was for comparison retail warehouse development providing 8,361 sq m of retail floorspace on ground floor with 4,181 sq m of retail floorspace at the mezzanine level together with associated car parking, cycle parking, servicing, access. The initial application documentation implied little retail restrictions.

1.49 The site has an extant planning permission for non-food retail bulky goods warehouse development of 8,361 sq m plus a garden centre of 1,394 sq m gross. Reserved Matters approval was subsequently granted in September 1998, and the consent has been technically implemented although the scheme has never been built-out. The site was considered at local plan inquiry in June 2000 and was subsequently allocated in the Local plan through policy S7 to recognise this extant consent. Paragraph 9.17 of the local plan makes it clear the allocation reflects the extant planning condition and indicates that the range of goods to be sold is limited by the permission to bulky goods and that other applications for development on the site would need to satisfy the relevant policy tests.

1.50 In response to the Salisbury Retail Park application, GVA Grimley’s independent review concludes “We are satisfied that there is a general need for additional comparison i.e. non food and shopping floorspace in Salisbury over and above the amount of floorspace permitted by the extant London Road retail warehouse consent. However, we have not identified any specific quantitative or qualitative need for additional retail warehouse development in the Salisbury area, over and above the existing extensive provision and the committed proposals, which are reflected in the adopted local plan. Any additional comparison shopping floorspace needs in the area should be accommodated within the City Centre, where a number of sites have been identified.”

1.51 The conclusion was that based on the Applicants failure to address the relevant policy requirements and adequately consider these issues, and in the absence of any further information or clarification on these issues, GVA Grimley considered there were retail grounds for refusal of the current proposals at the current time. As a result the applicants were asked to complete further assessment work in accordance with PPS6.

1.52 After the advice was received the applicant undertook some further retail assessment work, dated January 2008 of which GVA Grimley again assessed. The further report from the applicant now provided a detailed assessment which included matters of quantitative and qualitative need, alternative sites including the scope for disaggregation, and impact. In addition the applicant was now proposing a minimum size unit of 929sq m gross. GVA

Grimley acknowledged that the applicant had now prepared and submitted the necessary information and GVA Grimley are now in a position to address the effects of the revised scheme. and concluded that:

- The current proposals are of a materially different scale and form of development to that for which planning permission already exists
- Satisfied that the Applicants have demonstrated a clear quantative and qualitative need for a significant scale of additional comparison retail floorspace in the Salisbury area and that there is likely to be sufficient capacity for a larger development at London Road whilst still leaving significant capacity for additional development within the City Centre up to 2011.
- We are satisfied there is also a qualitative case for additional retail warehouse type development as permitted at London Road to contribute to meeting the needs of bulky goods retailers which may find it difficult to locate within the constrained historic city centre.
- The sequential test now provided identifies that there are no suitable sites or units likely to be capable of accommodating the scale of comparison floorspace needs identified by 2011, and there are not vacant units or sites likely to be suitable to accommodate a bulky goods retail warehouse type development.
- There are key opportunities coming forward in Salisbury City Centre, notably on the central car park / Maltings site which would be expected to accommodate a significant level of additional convenience and comparison goods floospace, although the development is unlikely to come forward from the period up to 2011 and is unlikely to be appropriate to accommodate significant bulky goods retail warehouse type development. In these circumstances we do not consider these sites could be regarded as being suitable, viable or available within a reasonable timescale to meet the identified need up to 2011 and in particular the needs of bulky goods retail warehouse type operators.
- Consider that the applicants assessment of a 5% impact on Salisbury City Centre is a reasonable estimate for a bulky goods development.
- Do not consider the impact of a restricted bulky goods development is likely to seriously undermine the vitality and viability of the City Centre, which would still be expected to experience significant growth in its turnover in real terms. However we consider an unrestricted open A1 retail park type development would have a materially different character and be likely to impact more directly on existing retailers and planned new developments in the city centre.
- In these circumstances GVA Grimley recommend that here are no sound reasons for refusal of the current proposals based on retail policy grounds, provided they are substantially restricted to the slae of bulky goods or at the very least to the preferred scheme tested by the applicant and subject to the suggested minimum unit size condition of 929 sq m.

1.53 The application was refused at committee on 23rd March 2008 and taken to appeal inquiry which was held the week commencing 23rd February 2009.

1.54 The appeal (ref: APP/T3915/A/008/2074782/NWF) was subsequently allowed subject to the conditions set out in the appeal statement (attached in appendix 1 to the documents) that states:

‘the range and type of goods to be sold from the non-food retail units hereby permitted shall be restricted to the following: DIY and/or garden goods; furniture, carpets and floor coverings; camping, boating and caravanning goods; motor vehicles and cycle goods; and bulky electrical goods’.

1.55 The inspector overall concluded that:

‘Talking all of these matters into account I consider that, while the proposed mix of bulky and non-bulky goods retailing would be unacceptably harmful to Salisbury City Centre, the development shoud be allowed subject to a bulky goods condition and one controlling the minimum size of the units. Also a number of other conditions as proposed by the Council and discussed at the Inquiry are necessary. These conditions on the detailed design and finishes of the scheme, hard and soft landscaping, environmental and other conservation measures, sustainable construction, provision of and control over cycle and car parking, servicing and related facilities, an acoustic barrier and other noise insulation measures, lighting, opening hours and delivery times, hours of construction, drainage, and archaeological investigation are necessary in the interests of the proper planning and development of the area. In the light of Circular 11/95 I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions in the interests of precision and relevant to the permission and have deleted the final sentence of the bulky goods condition in the interest of enforceability’.

1.56 As a result of this permission, which gives the applicant 3 years to commence this new scheme it is recommended that the allocation within the Local Plan (policy S7 and supporting paragraph 9.17) is no longer saved to ensure that the retail strategy is in accordance with PPS6.

1.57 This site will then be assessed further during the subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD, at which point it should be clear as to whether this scheme will be delivered or not. At the point that it is not, it will be considered for other uses.

1.58 Amesbury

GVA Grimley’s assessment of Amesbury has identified a relatively healthy town centre, which has experienced substantial investment in recent years. In particular, a replacement Co-Op store has recently opened and an attractive mixed use residential and retail scheme has been completed on the junction of High Street and London Road. The retail composition in the centre is consistent with GVA Grimley’s expectations of a centre performing a more local shopping function, i.e. the proportion of convenience and service retailers is above average, while the proportion of comparison units is below.

1.59 The centre has a monthly market and vacancy rates are significantly below national average levels. On this basis, and given the scale and mix of uses, GVA Grimley recommend that Amesbury be defined as a Town Centre over the forthcoming LDF period.

1.60 Convenience retailing in Amesbury - In terms of convenience goods the replacement Co-Op foodstore, which has recently now opened, will contribute significantly to the health of the centre and its overall attractiveness as a shopping destination. At present, a proportion of trade within Amesbury’s core catchment area is being directed towards competing foodstore destinations, outlined in Table 5. Any proposals for new foodstore development should take into consideration these market shares and consequent impact upon them.

Table 5: Key Foodstore Market Shares in Zone 2

Foodstore	Zone 2 Market Share
Foodstores: Amesbury Town Centre	24%
Foodstores: Salisbury Town Centre	12%
Tesco, Southampton Road	15%
Waitrose, Churchill Way	11%

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

1.61 Based on current market shares, the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment does not consider there is a need for a foodstore over the forthcoming LDF period in Amesbury town centre or the wider urban area. The objective should be to enhance the town centre, and support the role of the new Co-Op foodstore in underpinning the vitality and viability of the town centre. GVA Grimley's health check has identified the strong convenience and service role of Amesbury, and the weak comparison goods sector. Any competing out-of-centre foodstore provision is likely to result in an unacceptable impact on the town centre key role. If foodstore provision in the town centre is undermined, the role of other sectors is not sufficiently strong to maintain the centres health.

1.62 As such, the GVA Grimley retail and leisure needs study indicates a negative capacity of -29 sq m net by 2016 with respect to convenience floorspace. While a new foodstore in the urban area could claw back some trade lost to other out-of-centre foodstores in the district, GVA Grimley believe such a development will also impact substantially on the town centre. If an appropriate site came forward in the town centre for new foodstore development, GVA Grimley consider that Amesbury could support additional foodstore development through claw back and uplift in market share. Given leakage of trade to competing out of centre foodstore, GVA Grimley consider it possible that an appropriate foodstore development in Amesbury town centre could recapture lost expenditure. However, it needs to be reiterated that any such provision needs to be in the town centre.

1.63 It is also evident that there is development pressure from food retailers in out-of-centre locations i.e. in Amesbury's catchment area. As a consequence, given findings in relation to limited capacity, GVA Grimley have tested two scenarios to review the impact of an out-of-centre foodstore on current shopping patterns in and around Amesbury. Two different sized convenience scenario's were tested firstly 1,800 sq m net and secondly 2,500 sq m net. While GVA Grimley's overall conclusion is that the Council should adopt a cautious approach to new out of centre foodstore development, and these scenarios do not convey any support to either size of unit, it is necessary to quantify a scale of development for the purposes of impact testing to enable the Council to make informed decisions.

1.64 It is clear that the 2,500 sq m net foodstore will have a greater impact on existing town centres. We estimate a 1,800 sq m net foodstore will have a 4.4% impact on Salisbury City Centre, an 8.1% impact on out of centre foodstores in Salisbury's urban area, and a 33.2% impact on Amesbury town centre. The 2,500 sq m net foodstore will have a 5.8% impact on Salisbury City Centre, a 10.3% impact on out of centre foodstores, and a 37% impact on Amesbury town centre.

1.65 Clearly, at 33.2% and 37% respectively, the impact of a large out of centre foodstore on Amesbury town centre is significant. It is likely that a new out of centre foodstore will generate more sustainable travel patterns, ensuring that residents in the north of the district are not having to drive to major foodstore destinations in Salisbury town centre and the out of centre foodstore provision. A larger store would also improve access to a better range of food and non-food goods. However, if located outside the town centre, a new foodstore will have a detrimental impact on the health of Amesbury town centre that has recently been enhanced following the opening of a replacement Co-Op foodstore.

1.66 Since the production of the Retail topic paper the council has received a number of applications for out-of-centre supermarkets which potentially influence figures within the RLNS.

- S/2007/1616 – Proposed Lidl store (1063 sq m net)
- S/2007/226 and S/2008/1865 – Proposed Tescos (5564 sq m - gross)
- S/2007/2226 – Proposed Asda – (6131 – gross sq m)
- S/2008/1035 – Sainsburys - Demolition & re-development of existing vacant class a1 foodstore, car park, toilet block and removal of trees. erection of new a1 foodstore with deck car park, landscaping, servicing & associated development including

relocation of existing monument. (refused on 22nd December 2008) – (3082 sq m gross).

The implications of these applications will now be looked at separately.

1.67 S/2007/1616 – Proposed Lidl store
In response to this, GVA Grimley were instructed to carry out an independent review of the need and impact of future proposals (Review of proposed Lidl, Amesbury, November 2007). This application was accompanied by a retail assessment prepared by Atisreal, which criticises the Retail and Leisure Needs Study (RLNS) in a number of areas.

1.68 In light of the criticisms GVA Grimley reviewed the Amesbury convenience capacity modeling set out in the RLNS, and identified some areas in the analysis, which needed amending. They comment "Notably, we concur with Atisreal that the inclusion of an erroneous market share in the capacity analysis for Amesbury appears to have led to an over estimate of its convenience goods turnover. The RLNS identifies a 2006 turnover of circa £18.2m rising £19.6m in 2011. Based on the correct survey data we estimate that these figures should be £14.4m and £15.6m respectively suggesting the study significantly over states the potential available turnover in Amesbury based on the survey used at the time."

1.69 GVA Grimley goes on to state "The second issue which warrants clarification is the deductions to allow for committed floorspace. The RLNS makes an allowance of £13m for committed floorspace, which appears to include an arithmetical error and overstates the potential turnover of commitments. The only Amesbury commitment identified at the time was the new Co-op store estimated at 1,395sq.m net additional convenience goods floorspace, which at the Co-op company average turnover equates to a turnover of circa £7.3m. On this basis, employing the correct convenience turnover for Amesbury at 2011, of £15.6m, and taking benchmark sales of existing floorspace at circa £7.9m generates a notional surplus of £7.7m. On this basis, taking the average turnover of the new Co-op store at circa £7.3m, if this store was taken in addition to the reapplication of the former Co-op store for convenience retailing it would largely accommodate the identified capacity. Having recalculated the figures in the RLNS, we estimate that if the former Co-op store is only part reoccupied by a convenience goods retailer this would generate a notional capacity of circa £3.1m of convenience goods expenditure by 2011."

1.70 Taking the Atisreal assessment as a whole, and incorporating the amended RLNS figures, GVA Grimley concluded "If the former Co-op store in Amesbury Town Centre were to be reoccupied in its entirety by a replacement operator, achieving a comparable turnover to the Co-op, this would largely address the quantitative need at 2011 based on current market shares. This would also reinforce the overall conclusion reached in the Retail, Leisure and Need Study i.e. that there is no clearly defined need within Amesbury over and above identified commitments i.e. the Co-op based on constant market shares. In the event that the former Co-op store is not reoccupied in its entirety by a replacement convenience retailer achieving this level of turnover, we consider there will be a notional surplus capacity arising based on constant market shares."

1.71 Further advice with respect to this application was again provided by GVA Grimley in March 2008, this was based the receipt of a further application received for the redevelopment of the former co-op store in Amesbury Town Centre comprising a development of a new foodstore for Sainsbury's comprising 3,082 sq m gross 91858 sq m net) and the deliverability of this option. GVA Grimley concluded that it is broadly common ground that the new co-op store in Amesbury is trading very strongly and on current market shares where is expenditure capcity for reoccupation of the former co-op store if this was a viable / available option. GVA Grimley concluded that although indications have been given by Co-op at the unit and/or site could be available for an alternative convenience retail occupier, although from the evidence available there appears to be a significant degree of uncertainty as to the genuine availability and suitability of this unit for a discount foodstore.

1.72 However GVA also advised that ‘subject to the realism of the Sainsbury’s option, the council’s satisfying itself that it could genuinely be regarded as suitable, viable and available, we consider that such an option would largely meet a quantitative and qualitative need in Amesbury and would materially reduce the justification of supporting any further rout-of-centre convenience shopping provision in the area at the current time.

1.73 Furthermore they conclude that ‘In the context of the likely performance of the town centre co-op and new Sainsbury’s store in this scenario, we consider the impact of an out-of centre discount superstore as proposed by Lidl would be unlikely in itself to seriously undermine the viability of either store.

1.74 This store has since been given planning permission and has been built out and opened late 2008 / early 2009.

1.75 S/2007/226 and S/2008/1865 – Proposed Tescos (5564 sq m – gross, estimated to consist of 1950 sq m net convenience and 1022 sq m net comparison floorspace) S/2007/2226 – Proposed Asda – (6131 – gross sq m)- estimated to consist of 2415 sq m net convenience and 929 sq m net comparision goods.
GVA Grimley were asked to assess these stores at the same time and their advice was received in January 2008, this advice altered the figures within the RNLS slightly.

1.76 As a result of criticisms received from the two applicatiosn GVA Grimley reviewed the Amesbury convenience capacity modeling set out in the RLNS and identified two errors in the analysis. First, the inclusion of an erroneous market share in the capacity analysis for Amesbury appears to have led to an overestimate of its convenience goods turnover. The RLNS identifies a 2006 turnover of circa £18.2m rising to $19.6m in 2011. Based on the correct survey data, we estimate that these figures should be £14.4m and £15.6m respectively, suggesting the study significantly overstates the potential available turnover in Amesbury based on the survey used at the time.

1.77 The second issue which warrants clarification is the deductions to allow for committed floorspace. The RLNS makes an allowance of £13m for committed floorspace, which appears to include an arithmetical error which overstates the potential turnover commitments. The only Amesbury commitment identified at the time was the new co-op store estimated at 1,395 sq m net additional convenience goods floorspace, which at the co-op company average turnover equates to a turnover of circa £7.3jm On this basis, employing the correct convenience turnover for Amesbury at 2011, or £15,6m and taking benchmark sales of existing floorspace at circa £7.9m generates a notional surplus of £7.7m.

1.78 On this basis, taking the average turnover of the new co-op store at circa £7.3m, if this store was in addition to the full reoccupation of the former co-op store for convenience retailing, by a retailer with a similar turnover, it would largely accommodate the identified capacity. If the former co-op store was only part reoccupied by a convenience retailer, this would generate a notional capacity of circa £3.1m of convenience goods expenditure by 2011 – sufficient to accommodate the likely turnover of a discount foodstore in addition to the part reoccupation of the Co-op.

1.79 It is evident therefore that there is some identified capacity for additional convenience goods shopping floorspace in Amesbury based on current market share. The scale of capacity depends on the future of the former co-op store. However, it is equally evident that while the level of capacity identified could accommodate another small supermarket/discount foodstore (subject to the future of the former co-op unit), it would not support a new food superstore with a convenience goods turnover of that of the proposed Tescos or Asda.

1.80 In addition the impact assessment included within the RLNS incorporated the assumption that the convenience goods turnover of Amesbury Town Centre at 2011 would be circa £19.1m which for the reasons outlined above represents an overestimate of the centre's turnover. Accounting for the error identified in the market shares used in the RLNS, the indicated convenience goods turnover of Amesbury is more likely to be in the order of circa £15m (as estimated by GLH on behalf of Tescos), based on a a more up to dat household survey which incporoates the opening of the replacement co-op.

1.81 In practice these figures still result in there being an impact of about 40% or more on the convenience sector of Amesbury.

1.82 Since this time the proposed Lidl has now been constructed and is trading. The proposed Tescos and Asda stores have been subject to a call in inquiry which closed on 24th Apriil 2009. The outcome will be noted within this Topic Paper when known.

1.83 Comparison retailing in Amesbury – The Household Telephone Survey undertaken as part of the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study highlights the relatively weak trading performance of comparison goods floorspace in the town centre. This is entirely consistent with GVA Grimley's qualitative assessment which identified the below national average representation of comparison goods retailers in Amesbury. GVA Grimley identified that, Amesbury functions largely as a convenience and service centre. Based on current market shares, GVA Grimley's quantitative analysis has identified capacity for an additional 158 sq m net of comparison goods floorspace by 2011, 341 sq m net by 2016, and 550 sq m net by 2021. Our assessment has not identified retailer requirements for space in the centre.

1.84 Town Centre Boundary and Primary and Secondary shopping frontages - The GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Study considers that the town centre boundary and designation of retail frontages are appropriate for the forthcoming LDF period. In terms of development opportunities, the foodstore site allocated in the adopted Local Plan (2003) has now been brought forward for development, and there are no evident development sites to allocate. The town centre bus station could come forward for development, provided a replacement facility was identified beyond the town centre boundary. This option may be discussed in the Council's Transport Strategy. We would envisage small-scale infill development and redevelopment over the forthcoming LDF period.

1.85 While GVA Grimley consider frontage designations are appropriate for the forthcoming LDF period, it is prudent to mention the recently introduced Use Classes Order, this should enable local authorities to allow a certain level of A3 quality restaurant and café uses, while preventing undesirable drinking establishments and hot food takeaways in certain locations. Given the current health of the town centre, GVA Grimley believe the local authority should encourage A1 shop uses in the primary frontages, whilst managing a more flexible representation in secondary shopping frontages. For example, retail policies could restrict the proportion of A5 uses, while encouraging A3 uses in certain locations to encourage longer trip times.

1.86 Smaller Centres

The health checks of the smaller centres identified vital and viable shopping and service destinations. Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton all perform well as local village centres offering no more than essential 'everyday' requirements to a local catchment. Each centre has a Post Office, pharmacy and local top-up foodstore. Vacancy rates are particularly low in every centre. Wilton is the largest and busiest centre offering the greatest range of comparison units. Tisbury and Downton appeared the most rural and quiet villages with little through traffic, and Mere is an attractive and vibrant centre with good pedestrian footfall.

1.87 Each centre performs a local shopping function, and they do not appear vulnerable to decline in the current circumstances. It is also apparent that growth is unlikely over the forthcoming LDF period given their current function, built environment and rural 'village' settings. As the adopted Local Plan points out, these centres provide a necessary service within the local community and a social forum, especially for the less mobile and those without private transport. The forthcoming LDF period should continue the Council's commitment to retain village shops and resist their change of use. Policy S9 set out in the adopted Local Plan (2003) should be retained.

1.88 GVA Grimley consider that policy should ensure the network of local centres provides easily accessible shopping to meet people's day-to-day needs and should be the focus for investment in more accessible local services, such as health centres and other small scale community facilities, as encouraged in PPS6. As such the mix of uses in local centres should be carefully managed. In addition to policy to manage the change of use of existing buildings, frontage policies could be introduced in the central shopping area to protect A1 shop uses and other important service facilities.

1.89 The new Use Class Order can restrict undesirable A5 Hot Food Takeaways within this core area, which will in turn maintain the quality of important service and shop uses in the centre. Resisting change of use in designated frontages, particularly to residential, will help the long term sustainability of the village centres as they aim to implement relevant strategies over the LDF period. If frontage policies are not put in place, the centre will continue to erode and undermine the overall health of the centres.

1.90 Update on study

Since the study was completed, the new Co-op in Amesbury has been completed and is trading, as well as the Lidl. However despite its edge of centre location, local councilors informed us that several A1 retail units have closed although the centre is now beginning to recover.

1.91 Overall update

Since the RNLS was undertaken and due to the large number of retail applications that have been submitted it has become apparent that there were a number of discrepancies with the RLNS that GVA Grimley have conceded. As are result GVA Grimley have re-worked the retail figures, shown below, which results in retail floor space capacity projections being very slightly amended. The justification for this is provided within the updated Retail and Leisure Needs Study.

Convenience Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	1,157	2,241	3,385
Salisbury City Centre	464	1,389	2,365
Amesbury Town Centre	610	734	864

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

Comparison Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	9,211	22,551	38,218
Salisbury City Centre	5,031	13,346	22,970
Amesbury Town Centre	153	330	534

Source: GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study

1.92 A tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire

http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/leisure/tourism/tourism-strategy.htm

The tourism strategy has been underpinned by the following local evidence base:

Economic impact of tourism in Salisbury - South West Tourism (2003)
Salisbury destination benchmarking vistory survey - Tourism South East (2004)
Accommodation facilities in Salisbury - Infrastructure evaluation[4] Bournemouth University (2005)
Leisure facilities in Salisbury – Infrastructure evalution - Bournemouth University (2005)
South Wiltshire economic assessment - Salisbury District Council (2005)
South Wiltshire tourism SWOT analysis - Salisbury District Council (2005)
Towards 2015 - Shaping tomorrow's tourism South West Tourism (2005)

This strategy briefly touches on retailing in Salisbury, primarily as retailing's function as a toursit attraction. The Tourism Strategy identifes Salisbury as a popular and well-used shopping centre that is renowed for its high number of specialist independent shops, which sit beside many of the more recognisable nation name retailers. It identifies Salisbury's postion as an important sub-regional shopping centre that is however being increasingly threatened by new developments in Southampton, Bournemouth and Basingstoke as well as other centres such as Andover, where access and parking are perceived to be better than Salisbury. Winchester, where a major new developemnt is also plannerd, is also challenging Salisbury's mportance and popularity as a retail centre.

Beyond this the tourism strategy contains an action plan which, with respect to retailing, suggests the need to:

- Increase the number of national retailers in Salisbury
- To support the growth and development of salisbury as a home for independent retailers

More information regarding tourism can be found within the Tourism Topic Paper.

2. THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

National Policy Guidance

2.1 PPS6 Planning for Town Centres

The main objective of PPS6 is to promote the vitality and viability of town centres. This should be achieved through planning for growth and through the development, promotion and enhancement of existing centres.

- Promote the vitality and viability of town centres
- Plan for the growth and development of existing centres
- Promote and enhance existing centres
- Enhance consumer choice by making provision for a range of shopping, leisure and local services
- Support efficient, competitive and innovative retail, leisure, tourism and other sectors with improving productivity
- Promote economic growth of regional, sub-regional and local economies
- Deliver more sustainable patterns of development
- Identify the centres where development will be focused, as well as need for new centres of local importance

Town Centres and Shopping Frontages

- Development should be focussed in existing centres in order to strengthen and regenerate them
- Actively promote growth and manage change in town centres
- Define a network and a hierarchy of centres each performing their appropriate role to meet the needs of their catchment,
- If provision cannot be accommodated in identified centres, LPAs should plan for an extension of the primary shopping area
- Integrate extension to primary shopping area carefully in terms of design and to allow easy access on foot
- May deliver benefit s for consumers and LPAs should seek to make provision for them.
- LPAs should seek to identify, designate and assemble larger sites adjoining the primary shopping area.
- Define the extent of the primary shopping area and the town centre on the Proposal Map
- Identify and allocate sites
- Distinguish between primary and secondary frontages. Develop policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations.

Need for retail development

- Assess the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, taking account of both quantitative and qualitative consideration
- Identify deficiencies in provision, assess the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including the scope for extending the primary shopping area and or town centre, identify centres in decline where change needs to be managed

Network of centres

- Should consider a network of centres and their relationship hierarchy
- Through Core Strategy set out a spatial vision and strategy for the network and hierarchy of centres, including local centres, setting out how the role of different centres will contribute to the overall spatial vision for their area
- Encourage necessary regeneration in rural service centres.

- Enhance vitality and viability of market towns and other rural centres.
- Designated new centres where need has been established
- Identify opportunities to remedy any deficiencies in local provision
- Market towns and villages should be the main service centres in rural areas.
- Ensure that the importance of shops and services to the local community is taken into account.
- Farm shops can meet demand

Retail allocations
- Review all existing allocations and reallocate sites which do not comply with PPS6
- Scale of opportunity are directly related to the role and unction of the centre and its catchment
- A sequential approach for site selection
- Allocate sufficient sites to meet need for at least first five years from adoption

General retail development
- Set out criteria based policies for assessing and locating new development proposals, including development on sites not allocated in DPDs
- Residential or office development should be encouraged as appropriate uses above ground floor retail, leisure or other facilities.

Night time economy
- Encourage a range of complementary evening and night-time economy uses which appeal to a wide range of age and social groups.
- LPAs should ensure that there is an integrated approach to the evening and night-time economy, so that their planning policies and proposal take account of complement their Statement of Licensing Policy.

Leisure
- LPAs should consider the scale of leisure development they wish to encourage and their likely impact

Markets
- Seek to retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones.
- Ensure markets remain attractive and competitive by investing in their improvement

http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1143820

2.2 Proposed Changes to PPS6: Planning for Town Centres consultation (2008)

Suggests a refinement of the policy approach and suggests the strengthening of Governments policy on positive planning for town centres.

There is no proposed changes to the requirement for planning authorities to assess the need for new town centre development or to take account of scale, impact and accessibility considerations or the sequential approach in selecting sites for development in development plans.

The main changes relate to how some planning application shoud be considered and tested. The proposals remove the requirement of an applicant to demonstrate ‘need’ for a proposal which is in an edge of centre or out of centre location and which is not in accordance with an up to date development plan strategy. The policy replaces the existing impact assessment with a new impact assessment framework which applicants for proposals outside town centres need to undertaken in certain circumstances. Key features of the new test are:

- Broader focus with emphasis of economic, social and environmental as well as strategic planning impacts that enables positive and negative town centre and wider impacts to be taken into account.
- Identification of key impacts which applicants must assess, including: impact on planned in-centre investment: whether the proposal is of an appropriate scale (the previous scale test); and, impacts on in-centre trade / turnover which should take account of current and future consumer expenditure capacity. Where negative impacts are likely to be significant this will normally justify the refusal of planning permission.
- Identification of a number of wider impacts which should be considered, including: accessibility (the previous accessibility test) and sustainable transport considerations; impact on traffic; effects on employment and regenerations; and how the proposal will make efficient and effective use of land. Where there are likely to be some adverse impacts but these are likey to be outweighed by significant wider benefits arising from the proposal, the proposal should normally be approved.

The impact test also requires applicants to consider the appropriateness of the scale of development, and for LPA's to ensure that proposed locations for new development are accessible by a choice of means of transport and to consider the impact on car use, traffic an congestion arising from a proposal. Design quality, including (for the first time) how the proposal will hel[p mitigate the impacts of climate change, also forms part of the new test. The sequential test is retained.

The proposals also need to be assessed on the extent to which they promote consumer choice and retail diversity.

The extent of the impact test shoud be informed by the development plan, local assessments of the health of town centres and any other relevant published local information. Proposed change also require LPA's top take into account Regional Economic Strategies when planning for town centres.

Replacement para 2.42 makes it clearer that LPA's should judge the scale of development they consider appropriate for their area and should therefore consider preparing policies for the scale of developments likely to be permissible in different types of centre.

Draft PPS6 also requires LPAs to measure the following to measure the vitality and viability of the health of town centres.

- Proportion of vacant street level property and the length of time properties have been vacant: vacancies can arise even in the strongest town centres, this must be used with car. Vacancies in secondary frontages an changes to other uses will also be useful indicators
- Land values and length of time key sites have remained undeveloped: data on changes in land value and how long key town centre and edge of centre sites have remained undeveloped provide important indicators for how flexible policies should be framed and can help inform planning decisions.
- Perception of safety and occurrence of crime: should include views and information on safety and security, including from the threat of terrorism, and where appropriate information for monitoring the evening and nigh-time economy.

http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/3197981.pdf

2.3 Consultation paper on a new Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Prosperous Economies (2009)

http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/consultationeconomicpps.pdf

(this supersedes the consultation on PPS6 (2008).

Once finalised with replace PPG 4 and 5, PPS6 and parts of PPS7 and PPG13.

Confirms that economic development includes development within the B use classes, town centre uses and other development which achieves at least one of the following objectives whether in urban or rural areas

- Provides employment opportunities
- Generates wealth
- Produces or generates an economic output or products

Confirms main town centre policies as

- Retail (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres)
- Leisure, entertainment facilities, and the more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and publs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls)
- Offices and
- Arts, culture and tourism (theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels, and conference facilities)

With respect to town centres, the Core strategy should set out a spatial vision and strategy for the management and growth of the centres. As part of the vision and strategy LPA's should:

- Define a network and hierarchy of lower order centres to meet the needs of their catchments
- Make choices about which centres will accommodate any identified growth
- Take account where there is a need to avoid an over-concentration of growth in higher order centres
- Set out how identified growth and change will be managed across the network
- Where existing centres are in decline, consider scope for consolidating and strengthening or reclassify if reversing decline is not possible.
- Define primary and secondary areas and the town centre of their proposals map
- Define the extent of the primary shopping area and town centre on proposals map, and consider distinguishing between primary and secondary frontages
- Consider setting floorspace thresholds for the scale of edge-of-centre and out-of-centre development which should be subject ot impact assessments
- Where growth cannot be accommodated in identified existing centres, expand town centers and identify development opportunities, ensuring any extension are carefully integrated with the existing in terms of design and access.
- Have flexible town centre polices
- Encourage residential or office development as appropriate uses above growth floor retail, leisure and other town centre uses
- Ensure housing in out-of centre mixed-use developments is not used as a reason to justify additional floorspace in such locations
- Identify opportunities within existing centres for sites suitable for development or redevelopment
- Use relevant vitality and viability indicators, market information and economic data to inform toosl such as AAP', CPO's and town centre strategies
- Encourage high—density development within existing centres where appropriate.

Promotes consumer choice and competition for town centre development including:

- Diversification of uses
- Retail mix
- Recognise importance of smaller shops
- Retail existing markets and re-introducing others
- Conserve and enhance established character
- Plan for a range of tourism, leisure and tourism activities.

Former PPS6, set criteria for assessment retail applications, however, EC7.7 suggests that 'an apparent lack of sites of the right size an in the right location should not be a reason for LPA's to avoid planning to meet the identified need for development. In these circumstances, LPAs should set out criteria based polices for assessment applications.

Evidence to support planning applications has amended to just a sequential assessment and an impact assessment. The level of detail should be relevant to the size and scale of proposal. Comprehensive impact assessment only need for developments over 2500 sq m.

More detail is provided as to what constitutes a sequential and impact assessment.

2.4 PPG13 – Transport (With respect to retail development)

- Allocate or reallocate sites which are (or will be) highly accessible by public transport for travel intensive uses (including offices, retail, commercial leisure, hospitals and conference facilities), ensuring efficient use of land, but seek, where possible, a mix of uses, including a residential element;
- Policies for retail and leisure should seek to promote the vitality and viability of existing town centres, which should be the preferred locations for new retail and leisure developments.
- Local authorities should establish a hierarchy of town centres, taking account of accessibility by public transport, to identify preferred locations for major retail and leisure investment. At the local level, preference should be given to town centre sites, followed by edge of centre and, only then, out of centre sites in locations which are (or will be) well served by public transport.
- Where there is a clearly established need for such development and it cannot be accommodated in or on the edge of existing centres, it may be appropriate to combine the proposal with existing out of centre developments, provided that improvements to public transport can be negotiated.
- Where retail and leisure developments are located in a town centre, or on an edge of centre site as defined by PPG6, local planning authorities should consider allowing parking additional to the relevant maximum standards provided the local authority is satisfied that the parking facilities will genuinely serve the town centre as a whole and that agreement to this has been secured before planning permission has been granted.
- Local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of parking is in keeping with the size of the centre and that the parking provision is consistent with the town centre parking strategy.

http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1144015

2.5 Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West

- Salisbury is identified as a Strategically Significant City and Town within the RSS, this identifies Salisbury as a primary focus for development offering the greatest opportunities for employment, and the greatest levels of accessibility by means other than car. The strategy emphasis is to realise potential.

- Provision will be made to maintain and enhance the strategic function of these SSCTs through the development of a wide range of commercial and public services, community and cultural facilities and non-car links to the communities that they serve.
- Maximise centre opportunities.
- Improve accessibility of town centres
- Retain and improve the public realm
- Resist retail development out of town centres
- SSCT's to be the main focus for investment in retail and other major facilities requiring high levels of accessibility to the communities they serve recognising their focus as a focal point for extensive catchment area population
- Enhance and maintain the range and quality of central area facilities of market towns to meet future needs. Measures should be introduced to improve accessibility by sustainable modes
- Scale of investment in Retail and other facilities should take full account of changing patterns of behaviour and future levels of population growth

http://www.southwest-ra.gov.uk/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=836

2.6 Proposed Changes - Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West

Identifies that:

The cathedral city of Salisbury is a large free standing employment centre performing a traditional role for a wider hinterland of smaller towns and villages, and with a nationally important role as a tourism centre. The retail centre has a high quality image and good demand for retail units. The outward expansion of Salisbury is affected by environmental issues, including flooding and important wildlife habitats.

The key strategic aim is to extend and enhance Salisbury as an employment and retail centre so it can better serve the surrounding rural area and achieve greater levels of self-containment. The Salisbury Vision, developed by the local authority and other stakeholders anticipates significant improvements in the retail and cultural offer of the city centre together with housing provision and environmental and transport improvements.

For Salisbury SSCT, policy HMA11 states that 'Salisbury will enhance its role as an employment and service centre by providing for: improvements to retail, cultural, educational and tourism facilities…..'

The retail specific policies makes it clear that the central areas of SSCTs will also be the prime location for office development (B1a), which is not related to other commercial uses. The planning of office development at other employment development areas should reflect the need to avoid putting at risk any approved

Within the proposed changes there is an additional policy TC2 with respect to 'Other Centres'. Of relevance to south Wiltshire the policy states:

'Outside of strategic centres the planning of retail provision shoud be based on the following principles:

- The development of major new regional shopping facilities' will not be supported
- The planning of new centres to serve proposed new development areas should reflect the need to compliment rather than compete with the retail facilities in the relevant strategic centre'

http://gosw.limehouse.co.uk/portal/regional_strategies/drss

2.7 Regional Economic Strategy
Strategic Objectives are:

Regional Economic Strategy for the South West – 2006-2015 - Strategy
The final Regional Economic Strategy for the South West amends its aspirations slightly compared to the draft version and aspires that:

- South West England will have an economy where the aspiration and skills of our people combine with the quality of our physical and cultural environment to provide a high quality of life and sustainable prosperity for everyone
- South West England will demonstrate that economic growth can be secured within environmental limits to bring prosperity to the region

This should be achieved through

- Supporting business productivity
- Encouraging new enterprise
- Deliver skills for the economy
- Compete in the global economy
- Promote innovation
-

http://download.southwestrda.org.uk/file.asp?File=/res/general/RES2006-2015.pdf

2.8 Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 – Adopted April 2006

The structure plan identifies that employment, shopping, leisure and other service uses that attract large numbers of people should be concentrated at existing town centers.

http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning-home/planning-saved-local-plans/planning-structure-plan.htm

National Publications

2.9 Retail Developments in historic areas, English Heritage (2005)

The document aims to aid planning authorities in preparing and considering new retails schemes in historic areas.

According to the document the retail sector performs an important role in many historic centres and the historic nature of some centres acts as part of their retail brand and influences the way in which they are marketed. The importance of trading in historic town centres is key to their durability. In addition, retailing makes a key contribution to the culture and economy of towns today, as well as allowing for the continued viability of historic buildings through their adaptation for new uses.

There are a number of current and emerging trends in the retail sector including:

- The trend towards larger unit sizes
- The increasing tendancy towards mixed-use schemes
- A move away from covered shopping centres and mega-schemes
- The increasing polarisation of the retail market
- The advent of new technology and new forms of retailing

The key message of the document is that it is essential that decisions about future retail developments are based on an informed understanding of the historic environment.

2.10 South Wiltshire Economic Assessment 2008

Identifies that retail sales figures were more consistent in 2007, compared to the figures for 2006, but were often down month on month, with the likely cuase to be external factors such as competitirs and the draw of shopping centres in Southampton.

3. Linking it Together – what do other Local Strategies say?

3.1 Salisbury Vision

In 2005, Salisbury District Council, the South West of England Regional Development Agency (SWRDA) and Wiltshire County Council established a partnership and appointed consulted to undertake the vision exercise. The Salisbury vision should set out how the city will be in another 1-, 20, 30 plus years. The project will form the basis of an Area Action Plan for Salisbury and Wilton and will proposed potential land use changes.

The vision has resulted in 25 options, of which four potentially involve retailing within Salisbury.

3.2 Central Car Park and the Maltings: Redevelop the area for a mix of new uses with associated car parking anchored by a new food superstore. The redevelopment of the Maltings could extend towards Fisherton Street and incorporate new open space to act as a public square adjacent to the Salisbury Playhouse and the City Hall. The rearrangement of the island between the Mill Stream and River Avon to become a new park. The proposal would enhance Salisbury as a sub regional shopping centre by the provision of additional large floorplate retail.

3.3 Eastern Gateway / Southampton Road: Comprehensive redevelopment of Southampton Road, with the creation of a new mixed use quarter and the development of an 'Eastern Gateway'. With respect to retail development could result in a 3.86 ha loss in land for retail in the area. This would be replaced by residential.

3.4 Salt Lane and Brown Street car parks: Redevelop the surface car parks to include residential and retail.

3.5 Bus station: Redevelop the surface car parks to include residential and retail

http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/council/major-projects/vision/vision-progress.htm

3.6 The Maltings and Central Car Park site
The Maltings and Central Car Park site is the vision's most significant City Centre project. The site provides a City Centre location that creates an opportunity to deliver a Retail led, mixed use development that can greatly enhance Salisbury's position as a sub-regional and cultural centre.

3.7 The intention as specified in the Vision Report is to:

- Enhance Salisbury as a sub-regional shopping centre by the provision of additional large footplate retail premises for multiple retailers.
- Make better use of this strategic site
- Increase local economic development potential and improve footfall
- Release capital receipts to deliver other projects within the vision and maintain a significant parking revenue stream
- Facilitate a better link to the Market Place

3.8 The project should include:

- An opened up Market Walk creating a strong link between the new development and the Market Place
- A high quality landscape setting for the new development with enahancement of the River Avon and Millstream edges

3.9 The establishment of a cultural hub by;

- Improving or replacing the City Hall
- Improving the setting, appearance aof and access to the Playhouse
- Providing an associated outdoor performance area
- Relocating the library

3.10 Improve and develop Fisherton Mill to add to the development of a cultural focus and identity in this area.

3.11 The Maltings and Central Car Park sites together are approximately 7.4 hectares and are located north of Fisherton Street taking in the existing surface level car park, the two level decked parking and Sainsbury's supermarket, Priory Square, the play area north of the Maltings together with the whole of the central channel of the River Avon and Summerlock Stream. The 'Maltings' part of the site is regarded as the prime retail development site in Salisbury City Centre in the adopted local plan.

3.12 The current shopping centre, known as the Maltings, opened in 1986 and was last refurbished in 1999. It is anchored by a Sainsbury's supermarket of approximately 4,180 sq m gross. In addition to Sainsbury's, and also part of the same ownership there are 27 unit shops, consisting of around 4645 sq m gross. However the tenant line up is relatively weak. The only multiples of any note are Superdrug, Bakers Oven and Robert Dyas.

3.13 The complex is served by a two level decked car park providing a total of around 682 spaces. The adjoining Central Car Park accommodates a further 964 spaces, giving a total of 1626 spaces (over 40% of the city centre parking stock). 1,578 are currently charged. The shop mobility unit is located on the lower ground floor of the Maltings car park. The Central Car Park and the Maltings provides the council with approximately £2million gross annual income,

3.14 While it is intended to be used as shoppers car park, there is a substantial amount of long stay parking on the site. The replacement of car parking by floorspace has been one of the influences on the shape of future development on the site. The introduction and completion of Park and Ride to the city can enable the parking to be released. It would be more challenging to alter parking provision without this element of the city's parking strategy being in place.

3.15 The site is served by four vehicular accesses:

- A direct access from the A36 Churchill Way
- Summerlock approach – a public highway leading from Fisherton Street
- Avon Approach – a privat road in the ownership of the council
- Millstream approach – a private road also owned by the council.

3.16 Pedestrian access is also available via Market Walk, St Thomas Square and Malthouse Lane.

3.17 The freehold of the Maltings and Central Car Park is held by Wiltshire Council. A consortium of Land Securities plc and J Sainsbury (known as the Harvest Limited Partnerhsip and referred to as 'Harvest') have a long lease on the Maltings. The council leases back the decked car park on a full repairing basis. Sainsburys occupy their foodstore ona sub-lease from Harvest. Harvest Partnership is a full joint venture between Land Securities and Sainsbury's, which compares more favourably than historically when the ownerships were separate. The joint venture means that Sainsbury's operational and occupational requirements can be aligned with defining the opportunities for development of the site for a retail-led scheme.

3.18 Apart from the Library and the City Hall, third parties control all adjoining land that has the potential to be included in a wider redevelopment scheme. The pattern of land ownership is felt to be straightforward for a city centre site.

3.19 Sainsbury's have had a long-standing requirement for a new flagship store in Salisbury city centre as the current store is under-sized compared with current requirements. Harvest has developed future store layout options which have been taken to Harvest's Board which comprise directors of both companies. On 10 December 2008 Harvest's Board signed off the end of the Feasibility Stage which agreed the preferred store size and layout. However this information is still confidential to Sainsburys.

3.20 Justification for growth

The proposal to redevelop The Maltings and Central Car Park with a major retail-led scheme is predicated on the Salisbury Vision's assessment that it is required to enable the city to maintain its position as a sub-regional shopping centre in the face of increasing competition from nearby towns and cities. In particular, the Vision recognises the constraints imposed by Salisbury's historic built environment. It calls for the development of large footplate shops that will be attractive to national retailers who wish either to relocate from inadequate premises within the city centre or are currently unable to find premises locally.

3.21 This assessment of unmet demand from retailers and the need for Salisbury to improve its retail offer to shoppers has been a consistent theme of retail consultants' studies going back to the early 1990s. Most recently, a study undertaken by GVA Grimley LLP for the emerging South Wiltshire LDF Core Strategy summarised the situation as follows:

3.22 Our analysis identifies a vital and viable town centre … We have, however, identified potential signs of vulnerability and barriers to growth, as well as opportunities to enhance and strengthen the centre … At present, Salisbury is not a first choice shopping destination for a number of shoppers who instead choose to visit competing centres such as Southampton. Without new development in Salisbury, this position will only be exacerbated over the [Local Development Framework] period, as competing centres continue to improve and implement proposals in the pipeline ... In a 'do nothing' scenario Salisbury will fall further behind the larger stronger centres, and it is crucial for Salisbury to encourage investment and new retailers.[1]

3.23 Salisbury DC granted planning permission on 29 June 2004 (S/2002/0802) for a redevelopment of the Maltings. This was a modest extension of the Sainbury's store, rather than a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site. When the GVA Grimley RLNS was undertaken they were aware that this scheme would not proceed but they were unaware of the implications of the change in ownership of the Maltings site, again making the scheme more deliverable..

3.24 Site Feasibility

A feasibility study has been carried out by Alder King on behalf of Salisbury District Council to examine the likely capital and revenue implications in the immediate and long term. This is currently confidential. Although a report was taken to the Implementation Executive of Wiltshire council on 11 March 2009.

3.25 In December 2007, SDC commissioned consultants Alder King to undertake a feasibility study of the proposed redevelopment of The Maltings and Central Car Park. Alder King presented their final report in July 2008.

The consultants approached the study by carrying out a thorough assessment of the site and its environs to determine the extent of constraints and opportunities, including current third

---

[1] GVA Grimley LLP, Salisbury District Council – Retail and Leisure Needs Study, October 2006.

party rights over the land. Surrounding third party ownerships were investigated and a thorough design analysis was undertaken. The consultants examined the site's role as a car park and considered future parking needs and the Council's reliance on car parking income. Planning policy constraints were also identified (for example, the 40 foot height limit on new development in the centre of Salisbury).

3.26 Salisbury's need for additional shops, offices, residential and leisure premises was quantified and an assessment made of likely user and operator demand for these facilities. The consultants identified and spoke to a number of stakeholders, including Harvest as well as other key third party landowners. An analysis of the site's capacity to absorb desired development was also undertaken.

3.27 The consultants identified the core development site as comprising:

- The Central Car Park
- The Maltings
- The Millstream Coach Park
- The privately owned Riverside Car Park to the north of the electricity sub-station
- The Library
- Land to the front of the Playhouse Theatre.

3.28 Summerlock House and land owned by the Primary Care Trust, the Probation Service and Tesco Stores were excluded.

3.29 The majority of the identified site therefore falls within Council ownership and the number of third party interests is limited. The consultants contend that this arrangement reduces possible site assembly issues, which might give rise to increased cost and a protracted development timescale; especially if compulsory purchase is required.

3.30 Where the inclusion of third party land has been suggested, it is deemed to add beneficially to an enhanced design solution and scheme viability. The inclusion of the Library would enable a better link to the Market Place and the City centre to be created. The inclusion of the properties in front of the Playhouse would enable 'Fisherton Square' (Salisbury Vision Project 20) to be created.

Similarly, involving the coach park would allow development to take advantage of the site's location between two watercourses and provide an active frontage to both. The consultants consider that this arrangement should encourage adjacent third party landowners to reassess their land holdings and consider promoting all or part of them for sympathetic redevelopment in the future.

3.31 The consultants then prepared four masterplan options for the core site:

- Two similar preferred options, with alternative arrangements for car parking;
- An aspirational masterplan that ignored the 40 foot height limit;
- A reduced option that examined the possible redevelopment of the Central (surface) car park alone.

3.32 The preferred masterplan option suggests a two and three storey retail-led development with additional elements of residential or offices and community use. It is envisaged that retailing would take place at ground floor level with storage and possibly some retailing above. A residential use is introduced at first floor level in several areas. The accommodation comprises:

	Square Metres	Square Feet
Food store	8,125	87,425
Department store	6,390	68,756
Other retail	19,560	210,466
A3/A4/A5	4,482	48,226
Community	3,500	37,660
Residential	14,062	151,307

3.33 The existing Maltings food store and car park would be demolished, with the remainder of The Maltings being retained and significantly refurbished. 1,200 car parking spaces would be provided for shoppers, either beneath the development and/or in a multi-storey car park. An additional 169 spaces would be created to serve the proposed residential development. Service vehicles would enter and leave the site via a service road leading from Millstream Approach and providing access to the rear of the main retail units. Smaller units would be serviced via pedestrian routes within the development or by the use of trolleys from specified drop-off areas. Buses and coaches would also gain access to a dedicated drop-off point via Millstream Approach. Coaches would be expected to layover at the park and ride sites.

3.34 The library would be relocated to a new position adjacent to the Playhouse and City Hall, with a frontage on the newly created Fisherton Square. The existing library building would be refurbished and sub-divided to create retail floorspace spread over three floors. Market Walk would be refurbished in order to create a gateway entrance to the development from the Market Place. Residential development would be located on the sites of the current coach station and the Millstream Approach Car Park and at first floor level above some retail and food and drink units. (These sites could also be redeveloped with offices.)

3.35 The Playhouse, City Hall and Summerlock House would be retained as existing. Substantial public realm improvements would be made to routes between the new development and the rest of the city centre. Flood compensation areas would be created on land owned by SDC immediately to the north of the bridge link to Market Walk. Any re-contouring works would be undertaken in a manner consistent with the 'Living River' project.[2]

3.36 Development cost analysis

An analysis of the likely development costs and construction programmes of each of the four masterplan options was then undertaken. This work was then matched against development appraisals and cash flows in order to calculate whether the options were commercially viable. The results demonstrated that options 1, 2 (preferred) and 3 (aspirational) were to varying degrees all viable at typical investment yields[3]. Option 4 (development of the Central car park alone) was shown not to be a viable option.

---

[2] The Living River project aims to improve sections of the River Avon and its tributaries for the benefit of people and wildlife. It focuses on the creation of natural river edges and a variety of stream conditions and will make the area visually more appealing.

[3] Investment yield is the annual percentage return that is considered to be appropriate for a specific valuation or an investment, being expressed as a relationship between the annual net income (actual or estimated) and the capital value. In short, it is a measure of an investor's opinion about the prospects and the risk attached to that investment. The better the prospects and the lower the risks, the lower the expected yield and thus the greater the capital value. The required yield from an investment is estimated in the light of a number of factors including:

- The security in real terms of the capital invested;
- The security in real terms and regularity of the income;
- The ability to adjust the income to reflect market conditions;
- The complexity and cost of management;

3.37 Harvest have undertaken its own appraisals which point to a viable scheme. Harvest feel these are commercially sensitive and therefore again confidential.

3.38 The existence of the Salisbury Vision together with several rounds of consultation that have been undertaken on it, marks a significant step forward from the District Council's more plan-led support for development. The Wiltshire County Council, together with the South West Regional Development Agency and Salisbury District Council joint funded and supported the Salisbury Vision project and consequently support has been received for the projects throughout from these parties. In January 2009 a report was taken to the Implementation Executive of the Wiltshire Council where it resolved to:

3.39 To re-affirm support for the Salisbury Vision, including delivering the major projects as a priority, including the Maltings/Central Car Park and to note that the timing, funding and phasing of the individual projects including the Maltings/Central Car park a report was taken to Wiltshire Council's Implementation Executive on 16th March 2009. At this committee the executive resolved amongst others to:

(a) To confirm the overall objective of the proposed redevelopment; namely a 'retail led mixed use' scheme
(b) To note the conclusions of the Alder King feasibility study and authorise officers to continue working on The Maltings and Central Car Park project.

3.40 Implications of the Credit Crunch
The feasibility study was undertaken at a time of more normal market conditions, although the downturn had started. The economic situation may lead to some delays in all types of development,, but on he assumption that the financial situation will returns fairly soon to a more normal state, then progress should not be prejudiced in the loner term. Further feasibility work is being undertaken to inform the viability of the Core Strategy, including this proposal.

- The ease and likely cost of realising the capital;
- The tax position.

In considering the level of appropriate investment yield to appraise the masterplan options the consultants had regard to the historic level of investment yields achieved in the open market in similarly sized and located developments throughout the United Kingdom.

4. PRIORITIES AT COMMUNITY LEVEL.

4.1 2005-2009 Community Strategy

There is no mention of the economy or employment land in the South Wiltshire Community Strategy.

http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/living/your-community/community-planning/community-strategy

4.2 Local Community Plans (Parish, Ward and Market Town Plans)

The following community plans identify economic issues that could be incorporated into the LDF.

Four Rivers community plan - with respect to Wilton would like there to be Link between the Wilton Shopping centre and village to be provided. The area would also like local goods to be promoted by introducing Farmer's markets in areas where they are not established.

Mere and community plan - recognises that trade and business in the town of Mere and in the villages need support to aid sustainability.

Southern Area community plan - Maintain and enhance, where possible, retail units and services within villages

The Stonehenge community plan - Identifies that there is a need for an additional supermarket in the area. Within Durrington there is a need to preserve the current commercial and retail outlets and generally in Amesbury and Durrington better shopping is required. The community area would also like to see the protection of the village shops and post offices.

http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/living/your-community/community-planning/community-strategy

4.3 Amesbury Community Strategic Plan 2006-2016

Key objectives of the plan relevant to this Topic Paper are to:
- Promote Amesbury as great place to shop, work and visit
- Create better access to town facilities and services

Amesbury residents are concerned about the lack of choice in the quality and range of shops in Amesbury. There is a feeling that local shopping is shifting away from the town centre towards supermarket shopping. Vitality needs to be bought back into the town centre and this must be addressed by encouraging independent retailers with a diverse range of distinctive, interesting, quality products, particularly local food retailers – to be set up business particularly in the town centre itself. The strategy also suggests the local requirement for another supermarket to provide competition for the existing Co-op, small independent food shops such as greengrocers, butchers and fishmongers, teashops and coffee shops.

http://www.this-is-amesbury.co.uk/pdf/amesburyplan.pdf

4.4 Parish Plans

Several parish plans have now been approved by the council, where the centres are mentioned is detailed below.

http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/community/parish-planning/published-plans.htm

Alderbury	• The current level of provision within the village, particularly the village post office, is maintained • Increase availability of vegetables and fruit - Explore the possibility of twice weekly greengrocer stall Explore the viability of a farm shop • Develop village shopping scheme
Amesbury	Our consultations have told us that residents in both Amesbury and the surrounding parishes are concerned about the lack of choice in the quality and range of shops in Amesbury. There is also a recognition that as Amesbury has grown, its town centre has remained constrained in its ability to expand to cater for the growth. Despite the constraints imposed by Local Plan policy on out-of-town centre retail development proposals, there is a feeling among many that the focus for local shopping is shifting away from the town centre towards supermarket shopping in Salisbury or Andover – 'there are just too many estate agents and hairdressers, only on supermarket with no competition and nowhere eto get locally produced meat and vegetables or get a decent cup of coffee' – and using the local shops on housing estates outlying the town centre. If we are to bring vitality back into the town and particularly the town centre we must address this by encouraging independent retailers with a diverse range of distinctive interesting, quality products – particularly local food retailers – to set up businesses here, particularly in the town centre itself. We will work hard to support our existing retail businesses in Amesbury town, and to encourage new businesses to set up. We will encourage particularly those businesses that local people have told us are important – another supermarket to provide competition for the existing Co-op, small independent food shops such as greengrocers, butchers and fishmongers, teashops and coffee shops. We believe that there are the retail businesses, connected back to local food producers in the area, which will bring back the vibrancy to the town and town centre. As a focus for encouraging local food production and building on this year's successful Continental Market in the Barcroft car park, we will work with the Town Council to instigate a regular Farmers Market in the town centre.
Bemerton Ward	During the consultation it became apparent that although we appreciate the shops that already exist on the Ward we would like to see a wider choice available. Sometimes we are unable to obtain a particular product; a specific type of baby milk for example, so would like to see the owners take more interest in what the community's needs are. As in most locally run stores we find the cost of goods too high, as a community we would like to see the pricing in our local stores to be more competitive.
Dinton	Overall villagers showed how much they appreciated the shop and Post Office and the people who work there. The shop is owned by Bill and Margaret Thomson who have kindly provided answers to suggestions raised about its operation. Could the shop be open at lunchtime and later in the evening? Bill is reluctant to change the shop hours as he does not think he would recover the staff costs for the extra hours worked. He will, however, consider it.
Donhead St Mary	• Nothing relevant for this topic area.
Durrington	• Nothing relevant for this topic area.
East Knoyle	Wren's Shop is run and staffed by volunteers from the village, with the Post Office run by a part time post mistress. It has proved to be invaluable in encouraging community spirit and it has donated money and goods to a variety of local causes. It also underwrites ventures including Moviola and the First Responder scheme. For as long as it is able to survive without paid staff, it has the potential to raise large sums of money for community projects. Maintain support to ensure both the village shop and post office to continue to prosper.
Figledean	To provide a Community Shop with Post Office facilities

Landford	Make sure we all shop at our local shop and post office
Laverstock and Ford	**Laverstock -** The largest of the four communities is poorly served with retail facilities. The One Stop shop is generally a welcomed addition. **Hampton Park –** the neighbourhood of 490 homes is better provided for than others with a shop, vet and post office nearby. The likelihood of five hundred new houses will increase the need for retail outlets and it is hoped that the community, through the Parish Council will have the opportunity to influence the choice. **Old Sarum -** This small community is the most deprived in terms of facilities to support the residents. It has nothing. We know that the current new build of 500 houses will bring with it a selection of facilities however it would be the wish of the Steering Group that the Parish council will use the information gathered to influence the type and range of facilities.
Pitton and Farley	• We highly value the village shop in Pitton, encourage and support the local shop.
Tisbury	Contained within the Vision statement, it is clear that residents want the present level of services protected and enhanced, and the High Street to flourish. The Tisbury Parish Plan shows that residents are concerned with preserving and increasing the shops in the High Street and attracting new business enterprises to Tisbury to provide work for all. According to the plan the Tisbury community values its High Street greatly and seeks to arrest any decline in the number of shops and enterprises. As important, people see the need to provide adequate and appropriate business premises to attract new employers.

5. LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE

5.1 How do our existing policies perform ?

Although these are felt to be satisfactory, these need to be built upon. The existing policies are:

Policy	Purpose	Comment
S1	Prevents change of use within primary frontages if it would undermine the retail function of the town centre. Taking into account certain criteria.	The aim of this policy is to protect retailing in centres, primary frontages could be extended to protect the retail function of not just Salisbury and Amesbury but also Durrington, Tisbury, Wilton, Downton and Mere and furthermore the 2006 use class order could be used in order to protect the retail frontages further.
S2	Allows the change of use in secondary shopping areas subject to certain criteria	This again is to protect retailing in secondary shopping areas. The 2006 use class order could also be used in order to protect retail frontages further.
S3	allows new retail development in defined central shopping areas of Salisbury and Amesbury	This is a positive policy that allows retail development in the central areas; a similar policy statement could be encouraged in the core strategy.
S4*	Only allows new retail development outside of defined city/ town centre areas where a shopping allocation exists or no suitable town/ city centre sites are available. Preference to edge of centre sites and exceptionally out of centre locations. Proposals have to meet certain criteria	This restricts retail development; any policy should be amended to be in accordance with PPS6 or just rely on PPS6. If this is important to us locally something similar could be kept.
S5	allows retail development on Brown Street car park as part of a mixed use development	This site has not yet been developed. This site has potential to come forward, based on the work for the Salisbury Vision.
S6	allocates the Maltings to retail use, including the enlargement of the existing foodstore	Planning permission was granted, however there are land ownership issues that have not been resolved. It is proposed in the Salisbury Vision that a larger retail development is to be proposed on the central car park; therefore any policy would need to evolve accordingly
S7	Allocates land between Green Lane and London road for comparison retailing and employment use.	This site has not yet been developed, although an application is expected in the next few months. As this site would now be against PPS6 the allocation should not be taken forward within the Core Strategy.
S8*	Allocates the Redworth House site, Amesbury for a new foodstore	This site has now been developed; the area could now be incorporated into the central shopping area of Amesbury.
S9	provides criteria to assess proposals for small-scale shops or the change of use of existing buildings to small scale shops	A much more positive policy should be devised to promote small shops in villages.
S10	Permits alterations to existing shopfronts that respect the historic character and scale of the building / group of buildings	Should a more positive policy be devised and tied in with adverts.
S11	Allows the establishment of small scale farm shops subject to certain criteria	Principles met under PS1 and G2.
S12*	Allows new garden centres and extensions to subject to certain criteria	Policy is not effective and not required to achieve its aims.

*It should be noted that policies S4, S8 and S12 have not been saved and are therefore deleted from the Local Plan.

5.2 What are others doing to tackle similar problems?

A short benchmarking exercise was undertaken to understand how some other local authorities have dealt with retailing within their Core Strategies. This was achieved through a random internet search.

Sheffield - Identify the strengths and weaknesses of each option identified.
Options include say just office development in city centre or office development anywhere

Maldon – Retail appears in appears in Generic development issues and options. Within the same paper the first section is ‘Strategic Issues and Options’ which is preceded by a spatial portrait of the area. This section deals with issues such as restricting out-commuting, increasing skills of the workforce, increasing access to the wider community, making public transport more attractive, and establishing the retail hierarchy. The more generic development issues and options deal with the capacity for convenience and comparison goods, response to a low retail turnover, car parking, shopping mix, restaurants and eateries and the retail future of the smaller centres.

Suffolk coastal have proposed a ‘preferred’ option and then proposed other alternative options. They have further asked if there are any further options that should be pursued. It provides an objective and then asks if there are any other retail issue that should be addressed?

East Cambridgeshire have put together a three page summary for retail which explains the background to the district and the policy requirements, It then asks whether the LDF should protect the shopping function in market towns, prevent shops etc from closing, or allow unrestricted change of use.

Bradford metropolitan have used the Topic paper approach. There are then questions throughout the topic paper asking consultees to comment.

6. KEY ISSUES AND SPATIAL PATTERNS

6.1 General

- Make provision for a range of shopping and leisure, support an efficient, competitive and innovative retail, leisure, tourism sector
- Be cautious of any more out of centre foodstore development including extensions (GVA Grimley retail study)
- Allow residential or office development above ground floor retail (PPS6)
- Retain and enhance existing markets, where appropriate re-introduce or create new ones (PPS6)
- Market towns and villages should be the main service centers in rural areas (PPS6)
- Ensure parking provision is in keeping with the size of the centre. (PPS6)
- Resist retail development out of town centers (submission draft: Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West)

6.2 Salisbury

- There is a continued polarisation towards larger centers and the provision of larger stores in these larger centers. Salisbury could be in a vulnerable position as a retail centre especially if competing centers continue to implement major improvements to the town centers. Salisbury is well placed to benefit from forecast spending growth but it needs to adapt if it is to capitalize on these opportunities, and maintain and enhance its position within the wider region. Opportunities should be taken to enhance and strengthen Salisbury centre. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Salisbury should encourage investment and new retailers (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- New format retail development should happen in conjunction with protecting and enhancing the historic environment, tourist economy and differential / specialist retail offer. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Salisbury should retain its recognized identity, maintain Salisbury's identify and differentiation. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Provide for new department stores, higher order and mainstream retailers (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Linkages and integration of different sites and schemes should underpin the future of the city centre, and one option to achieve this comprehensive approach is through an Area Action Plan. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Provide for greater menswear units (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Low vacancy rates represent a barrier to growth. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Redevelop Southampton Road /Eastern Gateway and create a new mixed use quarter and the development of an 'Eastern Gateway'. With respect to retail development could result in a 3.86 ha loss in land for retail in the area. This would be replaced by residential. (Salisbury Vision)
- Redevelop Salt Lane and Brown Street Car parks to include residential and retail.
- Redevelop the Bus Station to include residential and retail (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study and the Salisbury Vision)
- Plan for an extension of the primary shopping area, which are carefully integrated (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Fill the gaps in provision to ensure Salisbury maintains its position as a higher order centre in the sub-regional hierarchy. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Maintain city centre boundary, maintain primary and secondary frontages (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Consider designating Fisherton Street as a special policy area to protect existing uses, to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment and prevent the introduction of hot food takeaways. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)

- Redevelop the Maltings and Central Car Park the area for a mix of new uses with associated car parking anchored by a new food superstore. (Salisbury Vision)
- Define the extent of the primary shopping frontages, distinguish between primary and secondary frontages (PPS6)

6.3 Floorspace need requirements

The following additionally floorspace requirements has been identified for the district within the GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study.

Convenience Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	1,516	2,623	3,790
Salisbury City Centre	262	1,178	2,145
Amesbury Town Centre	-131	-29	78

Comparison Goods Baseline Capacity Projections (sq m net)			
Area	2011 (sq m net)	2016 (sq m net)	2021 (sq m net)
Total District	9,181	22,488	38,115
Salisbury City Centre	5,031	13,346	22,970
Amesbury Town Centre	117	253	408

6.4 Amesbury

- There is not a need for a new out of town foodstore in Amesbury over the LDF period. An out of town foodstore would have a detrimental impact on the health of Amesbury (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Support should be provided for the town centre Amesbury Community Strategic Plan 2006-2016)
- Figures indicate a negative foodstore capacity of –29sq m net by 2016 (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Amesbury's town centre boundary and designation of retail frontages are appropriate for the LDF period. Should encourage A1 shop uses in primary frontages (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Manage a more flexible representation of secondary shopping frontages for example retail policies could restrict the proportion of A5 uses, while encouraging A3 uses in certain locations (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- A local wish for a additional supermarket in the area (The Stonehenge community plan, Amesbury Community Strategic Plan 2006-2016)
- Amesbury and Durrington need better shopping (The Stonehenge community plan)

6.5 Other villages

- Network of smaller centres provides easily accessible shopping to meet day to day needs (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Maintain quality of important service and shop uses in network of centres. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Resist change of use in designated frontages, particularly residential to hep long-term sustainability. If this is not achieved centres will erode. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Manage change of use with frontage polices to protect A1 shop uses and other important services (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Restrict undesirable A5 hot food takeaways in core areas. (GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study)
- Define a network and a hierarchy of centres each performing their appropriate role to meet the needs of their catchment (PPS6)

- Provide a link between the Wilton’s Shopping Centre and the centre of the village (Four Rivers Community Plan)
- Trade and business in Mere needs support to aid sustainability (Mere and Community Plan)
- Maintain and enhance retail units in the southern villages (Southern Area Community Plan)
- Need to preserve Durrington (Stonehenge Community Plan)
- Define the extent of the primary shopping frontages, distinguish between primary and secondary frontages (PPS6)

7. OPTIONS

Based on the issues identified and the policy framework in place, this section draws together options. The tables below represent a long list of options from which the most realistic are identified in the final row. The impacts identified are compared against the sustainability criteria in the Appendix of this topic paper

Option No.	Nature of the Option	Key Drivers	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Viability of proceeding with the option?	How will success be measured	Where is the option best pursued?
7.1	Without investment in the city centre and the addition of new format retail units Salisbury City centre will experience decline. Should the council build a new mixed-use development including retail units on the central car park in order to meet the identified shopping need, which could be anchored by a new supermarket?	GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study, Salisbury Vision	Continued vibrant city for Salisbury that will ensure it is viable into the future. Encourage implementation of the car parking strategy.	May be disruption during construction, potential loss of car parking revenue for the council.	The cost of construction together with additional improvements should be able to be met by any chosen developer.	Identified retail need being met in Salisbury through the construction of a high quality development.	Core Strategy followed by Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.
7.2	Do not invest in Salisbury City Centre.	None	Few.	Salisbury City Centre may decline.	Viable, as no change would be needed.	N/A	Do not pursue.
7.3	Should Southampton Road be redeveloped and if so where should the displaced retail floorspace go?	Salisbury Vision	A welcoming gateway to Salisbury is created that is not congested.	Again there may be disruption during construction and whilst changes are occurring.	The cost of construction together with additional improvements should be able to be met by any chosen developer. Retail operators may need incentives to move.	The introduction of a welcoming gateway to Salisbury.	Core Strategy followed by Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.
7.4	Should the primary and secondary frontages that exist be maintained?	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study, continuation of Local Plan frontages.	Planning policy is able to control the uses within certain areas in order to ensure that the	If demand was not there, shop units could remain empty; this is unlikely to occur in Salisbury.	Continuation of a similar policy that already exists, however more control can now be	Providing a health mix of town centre uses.	Core Strategy followed by Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan

Option No.	Nature of the Option	Key Drivers	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Viability of proceeding with the option?	How will success be measured	Where is the option best pursued?
			correct mix of town centre uses are implemented. This needs to be carefully managed alongside any proposed retail development.		had through the new use class order.		
7.5	Should Fisherton Street be designated as a Special Policy Area?	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study and the recognition that Fisherton Street is important to the vibrancy of Salisbury.	Fisherton Street should not only remain an important shopping area of individual retailers but the area is enhanced and improves.	There should ideally be few negative impacts is a policy is constructed correctly.	There is no reason why this cannot be implemented.	Fisherton Street remains an important area of individual and local retailers.	Core Strategy and Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.
7.6	Do not designate Fisherton Street as a policy area.	None.	Few.	Fisherton Street may decline if it is not protected.	Viable.	N/A	Do not pursue.
7.7	Are there any other ways we could support the niche retailers in the City?	GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study.	May be able to help ensure the continued existence of Niche retailers in Salisbury that are so important to drawing shoppers to our centre.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Core Strategy and Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.
7.8	Amesbury - Should a new out of centre supermarket be provided in Amesbury even if this may have a negative impact on the town centre?	Local Councillors.	People in Amesbury have a greater choice of supermarket shopping.	Shops in Amesbury Town Centre close, as they are unable to compete with the supermarket, resulting in Amesbury dying as a centre.	As there are no available sites in the Town Centre or edge of centre, this is against government policy. Even policy measure potentially could not save shops closing so it may be difficult to provide counter policies.	Amesbury Town Centre is enhanced and becomes more prosperous, however if this measure is pursued this is unlikely to occur.	It is best if this measure is not pursued.
7.9	Amesbury - Should the council use their CPO powers to build a site in the town centre even though this could	Pressure from Local councillors to deliver a new supermarket in Amesbury.	People in Amesbury have a greater choice of supermarket shopping.	Some buildings in Amesbury town centre may need to be compulsorily purchased and demolished.	Be very cautious. This could be achieved, however, it takes a long time and would take a large amount of officer time and cost	The construction of a new convenience store in Amesbury Town Centre.	Core Strategy, Site Specific Allocations, however the council need to be cautious.

Option No.	Nature of the Option	Key Drivers	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Viability of proceeding with the option?	How will success be measured	Where is the option best pursued?
	take some years				in order to be achieved.		
7.10	Amesbury - Should the council continue to have a town centre boundary and retail frontage to be used to encourage certain uses in different areas and should these be amended, if so where.	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study, continuation of Local Plan frontages.	Planning policy is able to control the uses within certain areas in order to ensure that the correct mix of town centre uses are implemented. This needs to be carefully managed.	If demand was not there, shop units could remain empty. This could be a concern for Amesbury.	Continuation of a similar policy that already exists, however more control can now be had through the new use class order.	Providing a health mix of town centre uses.	Core Strategy.
7.11	Amesbury - What kind of uses should be encouraged in the town centre?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Core Strategy.
7.12	Amesbury - What kind of uses should be encouraged in the primary shopping frontages?	Use Class Order 2006.	The council is able to use the Use Class Order in order to control the proportion of various town centre uses.	If implemented correctly there should be few negative impacts.	High.	A mix of quality town centre use.	Core Strategy
7.13	Local centres - Should the council implement a policy to ensure the network of smaller centres (Tisbury, Downton, Wilton and Mere) are maintained?	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study.	The local centres remain viable.	If implemented correctly there should be few negative impacts.	High	The Local centres continue to perform as such and the variety of provision is enhanced.	Core Strategy
7.14	Should the council not support a network of smaller centres.	None.	Probably very few as centres may decline.	Local centres may decline.	Viable.	N'/A	Do not pursue.
7.15	Local Centres - Should a central shopping area be	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study.	The local centres remain viable	If implemented correctly there should be few negative impacts.	High	The Local centres continue to perform as such and the variety of provision is enhanced.	Core Strategy

Option No.	Nature of the Option	Key Drivers	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Viability of proceeding with the option?	How will success be measured	Where is the option best pursued?
	introduced to protect the retail use and other important services whilst also allowing offices and residential above?						
7.16	Local Centres- Should primary frontages be designated and polices introduced to protect the retail use further for example restricting A5 use (hot food take-aways)?	PPS6, GVA Grimley Retail and Leisure Needs Study.	The local centres remain viable	If implemented correctly there should be few negative impacts.	High	The Local centres continue to perform as such and the variety of provision is enhanced.	Core Strategy
7.17	Local Centres - Should the local centre in Durrington be identified and shopping frontages be designated in order to protect the retail use?	Stonehenge community plan.	Local shopping facilities in Durrington are protected.	Unknown.	High	The Local centres continue to perform as such and the variety of provision is enhanced.	Core Strategy
7.18	Local Centres - Should a link be provided between Wilton Shopping Centre and the village centre? Where could this go?	Four Rivers community plan.	Wilton becomes more integrated and the centre becomes more viable.	Wilton shopping centre takes over as the centre.	Due to historic and densely built nature of Wilton it may be difficult to identify a link.	An integrated link is created.	Core Strategy and Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.
7.19	Local Centres - Should the markets be enhanced?	PPS6, Four Rivers community plan.	The market becomes more attractive to shoppers, enhancing the incomes of local producers.	Unknown.	Although the core strategy can encourage enhancement, a revenue stream would need to be identified to achieve this, this potentially	Enhanced markets and more prosperous communities.	Core Strategy and Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan.

Option No.	Nature of the Option	Key Drivers	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Viability of proceeding with the option?	How will success be measured	Where is the option best pursued?
					could be achieved through section 106 contributions?		
7.20	Do not enhance the markets.	None.	Probably very few.	Unknown.	Viable.	N/A	Do not pursue.

8. INITIAL CONSULTATION

8.1 Sent to economic development and City Centre Manager, comments received back verbally from the City Centre Manager.

Copies were also sent to the following on 1st June 2007 for comments:

- South Wiltshire Economic Partnership
- Wiltshire and Swindon Economic Partnership
- Salisbury tourism Partnership
- Wiltshire Rural Regeneration Partnership
- Wiltshire Market Towns Partnership

No comments were received.

9. Bibliography

Amesbury Community Strategic Plan 2006-2016
http://www.this-is-amesbury.co.uk/pdf/amesburyplan.pdf

A tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/leisure/tourism/tourism-strategy.htm

Local Community Plans (Parish, Ward and Market Town Plans)
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/living/your-community/community-planning/community-strategy

Parish Plans – various
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/community/parish-planning/published-plans.htm

PPS6 Planning for Town Centres
http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1143820

Proposed Changes to PPS6: Planning for Town Centres consultation (2008
http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/3197981.pdf

PPG13 – Transport (With respect to retail development)
http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1144015

Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West
http://www.southwest-ra.gov.uk/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=836

Proposed Changes - Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West
http://gosw.limehouse.co.uk/portal/regional_strategies/drss

Regional Economic Strategy
http://download.southwestrda.org.uk/file.asp?File=/res/general/RES2006-2015.pdf

Retail and Leisure Needs Study 2006 (GVA Grimley – 2006)

Review of proposed Lidl, Amesbury (2007) GVA Grimley for Salisbury District Council

Review of Salisbury Retail Proposals (2007) GVA Grimley for Salisbury District Council

Salisbury District Council - 2005-2009 Community Strategy
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/living/your-community/community-planning/community-strategy

Salisbury Vision
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/council/major-projects/vision/vision-progress.htm

Tisbury Parish Council (2007) Tisbury Parish Plan
http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/tisbury-parish-plan.pdf

Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 – Adopted April 2006
http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning-home/planning-saved-local-plans/planning-structure-plan.htm

Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 24 February 2009

Site Visit held on 27 February 2009

by Mary Travers BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
7 April 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/T3915/A/08/2074782/NWF
Salisbury Retail Park, London Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Cranford (Salisbury) Ltd against the decision of Salisbury District Council.
- The application Ref S/2007/1460 dated 16 July 2007 was refused by notice dated 28 March 2008.
- The development proposed is a retail warehouse development providing 8,361 sq m of retail floorspace on the ground floor with 4,181 sq m of retail floorspace at mezzanine level, together with associated car parking, cycle parking, servicing, access and landscaping.
- The Inquiry sat for four days, 24th–27th February 2009.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a retail warehouse development providing 8,361 sq m of retail floorspace on the ground floor with 4,181 sq m of retail floorspace at mezzanine level, together with associated car parking, cycle parking, servicing, access and landscaping at Salisbury Retail Park, London Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire in accordance with the terms of the planning application Ref S/2007/1460 dated 16 July 2007 and the plans submitted therewith, as amended, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's reasons for refusal included concerns about the landscape impact of the proposed scheme, whether its design and construction would meet the challenge of climate change, whether it would adequately facilitate the lowering of the A30 road at St Thomas's railway bridge, and the effects of lorry and car movements on the wider highway system and settlements around the site. At the opening of the Inquiry the Council confirmed that it accepted that all of these concerns were capable of being resolved by a legal agreement, the imposition of certain conditions and in the light of the Appellant's evidence on these matters. An executed S106 planning obligation covering some of these matters was submitted at the Inquiry and I am satisfied that it is in accordance with the advice in Circular 05/2005.

3. The site has the benefit of planning permission for a non-food retail warehouse park of 8,361 sq m (comprising four units) and a garden centre of 1,394 sq m.

This relates to an outline planning permission granted in 1995 and subsequent approval of the reserved matters. Condition 15 of the permission restricts the range of goods that may be sold to a specified list[1] generally comprising what are commonly understood as bulky goods. It is not disputed that this permission has been implemented by the carrying out of certain works but the site as a whole remains undeveloped. The Council made clear at the Inquiry that given local plan Policy S7 to which I refer further below and this planning history, it considers that a "truly bulky goods scheme" would be acceptable on this site.

Main Issues

4. There are two main issues in this case. The first is whether the proposal would be harmful to the role of Salisbury city centre, having regard to the development plan for the area, the extant planning permission on the site and the other material considerations, and secondly, whether safe and sustainable provision would be made for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site.

Reasons

Background

5. The appeal site of about 3.6ha is located close to the north-eastern edge of Salisbury and has frontages to the A30 London Road and Pearce Way in the vicinity of the Hampton Park roundabout. The area to the west of the site is mainly residential in character, while on the south-eastern side of London Road there is commercial development, including new office buildings, and a park and ride site. Further to the east, the site and surrounding area are dominated by and visible from the Laverstock Downs.

6. Eight retail units are to be provided in accordance with the appeal proposal, each with ground floor and mezzanine levels. It is proposed that the smallest size of unit should be restricted by a planning condition to 929 sq m and that the range and type of goods should also be restricted by a bespoke planning condition to the effect that a minimum of 58% of the total gross floorspace would be devoted to bulky goods. Aligned with the proposed condition, the Appellant has provided an updated list of potential occupiers for the units. These are JJB Sports/other sports retailer, DFS, TK Maxx Home, Mamas and Papas, Maplin, Laura Ashley Home, and Asda Living for Units 1 to 7-8 respectively.

7. A total of 405 car parking spaces would be provided together with cycle parking and a package of highways and transport improvements including a financial contribution to enhanced bus services, improvements to the pedestrian and cycle way network, including a new link between Green Lane (a pedestrian and cycleway route along the western boundary of the site) and London Road.

[1] The condition states, "The range and type of goods to be sold from the non-food retail units, hereby permitted, shall be restricted to the following: DIY and/or garden goods; furniture; carpets and floor coverings; camping, boating and caravanning goods; motor vehicle and cycle goods; and bulky electrical goods. Goods falling outside this range may be sold only where they form a minor and ancillary part of the operation of any of the proposed stores."

Development Plan Context

8. The development plan for the purposes of this appeal is formed by the regional spatial strategy, Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (RPG10) (2001), the Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan (WSSP) (2006) and the Salisbury District Local Plan (SDLP) (2003). WSSP Policy DP5 generally reflects national and regional planning policies by seeking to concentrate shopping and service uses in town centres. Policy DP6 defines Salisbury as a sub-regional centre in the retail hierarchy and makes clear that provision for out-of-centre shopping should be made only in specified, limited circumstances.

9. SDLP Policy S7 allocates the appeal site for comparison retailing and employment use, subject to local highway improvements, public transport provision and other matters, while Policy S6 allocates the Maltings site in the city centre (to which I refer in more detail below) for retail use, including the redevelopment and enlargement of the existing foodstore. Policies S6, S7 and others have been `saved' by the Secretary of State in accordance with the direction issued in September 2007. On the face of it, the appeal proposal for comparison retail development on the subject site appears to be in accordance with Policy S7.

10. However, the reasoned justification for Policy S7, while not itself `saved', casts doubt on whether the policy allocation is for unrestricted comparison goods development; this doubt arises from its references to the extant planning permission for a bulky goods scheme on the site and that a retail impact assessment may be required for other applications for retail warehouse development on the site. I can find nothing in the evidence about the emergence of Policy S7 that supports its interpretation as an allocation for unrestricted comparison goods retailing. Moreover, Policy S7 pre-dates Planning Policy Statement 6: *Planning* for *Town Centres* (PPS6) (2005) which sets out a number of criteria for the assessment of retail proposals. As paragraph 3.4 advises, need, scale, sequential approach to site selection, impact on existing centres, and accessibility should be taken into account. Also, Policy S7 should be read in context with Policy S6 which proposed a much more limited scale and type of development on the Maltings[2] compared with what is now proposed there. So, the context in which Policy S7 was adopted has since changed significantly.

11. In my view the saving of Policy S7 by the Secretary of State does not remove the need to assess the appeal scheme against the PPS6 criteria and in the current planning context. Taking all of these factors into account, only limited weight should be attached to the appeal scheme's apparent accordance with Policy S7, and it is necessary to consider the scheme against PPS6. So far as this case is concerned, the test of scale can be subsumed within the other tests and I deal with the accessibility test as part of the second issue below. It is necessary first however to consider emerging planning policy for Salisbury and in particular the background to the current proposals for the Maltings site.

[2] This comprises the existing Sainsburys superstore, 27 retail units and a decked car park.

Emerging Policy and the Proposals for the Maltings

12. The Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West, incorporating the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes, notes in regard to this area that the key strategic aim is to extend and enhance Salisbury as an employment and retail centre so it can better serve the surrounding rural area and achieve greater levels of self-containment. It refers to the Salisbury Vision document (SV) which anticipates significant improvements in the retail and cultural offer of the city centre as well as other improvements. The SV has emerged from over two years of extensive research and consultation and includes as a strategic objective the redevelopment of the Maltings and Central Car Park site (MCCP)[3] for a major mixed use retail-led scheme. The rationale is to enhance Salisbury as a sub-regional shopping centre by the provision of additional large floorplate retail premises for multiple retailers. This project is considered as "crucial to the viability and vitality of the city centre" and the delivery schedule indicates that it will be completed during 2014.

13. The SV is intended to be as self-financing as possible, and income generated by the MCCP will be used to fund the delivery of projects which have no commercial value of their own such as public realm and road improvements. The Council adopted the Salisbury Vision in June 2008 as a key strategic document for the Local Development Framework (LDF) and in January 2009 the Implementation Executive of the emerging unitary authority, Wiltshire Council, reaffirmed its support for the Vision including MCCP as a priority scheme.

14. The Second Preferred Options document (Sept 2008) for the South Wiltshire Core Strategy identifies that MCCP has support for a major mixed use scheme that delivers an enhanced retail offer. This reflects the work undertaken on the SV, a detailed retail study and further work that concludes that the majority of the identified need can be accommodated on MCCP, and the outcome of a feasibility study of MCCP undertaken in 2008. The feasibility study remains confidential while work to secure the development agreement continues, but evidence was given to the Inquiry that it provides a basis for taking forward proposals for a scheme of up to 32,516 sq m net of new retail accommodation including a new foodstore, department store and a range of other shop units to cater for national, regional and local traders.

15. It has been confirmed that the MCCP scheme will form a strategic proposal in the Core Strategy, due to be submitted to the Secretary of State in September 2009. This approach reflects the advice on strategic sites in revised Planning Policy Statement 12 (2008) and it updates the intention in the SV to bring MCCP forward through an Area Action Plan. The Council is likely to prepare a development brief for the site in the near future and this will be adopted as a local development document.

Retail Need

16. The evidence put to the Inquiry on retail need is based primarily on the Retail and Leisure Needs Study 2006 (RLNS) carried out for the Council by GVA

[3] In addition to the existing Maltings shopping centre, MCCP includes the very large surface level public car park owned by the Council.

Grimley in order to provide a context for policies and proposals within the LDF. It indicates a very substantial level of need for additional comparison goods floorspace in the District in the period up to 2021. In meeting this need it is concluded that it will be important for Salisbury city centre to enhance and consolidate its role and to prevent further erosion of its market share as competing centres increase their attractions through planned developments. Reference is made in particular to a need to bring forward development proposals to stimulate demand from higher-order, mainstream and quality comparison goods retailers to fill the gaps in provision. I conclude therefore that the role of the proposed MCCP redevelopment in/on the edge of Salisbury city centre is a very important consideration.

17. If MCCP were to come forward by 2016 there would be insufficient capacity for both it and the appeal scheme, assuming that MCCP provides for a net additional comparison goods floorspace of the order of 23,000-26,000 sq m and that market share remains constant. Once opened and established as a shopping centre, MCCP could be expected to improve Salisbury's market share, but in the interim there is no reason to expect market share to increase and there are grounds for fearing that it will decline as a result of increased competition from centres outside the district. I conclude that there is insufficient evidence of a quantitative need for both the appeal scheme and MCCP over the next five-seven years approximately. Regarding qualitative need, I deal with linked considerations about retail offer and site suitability below but none of the evidence leads me to conclude that the qualitative need for improved comparison shopping in Salisbury favours the appeal scheme over the importance of bringing forward MCCP.

18. The RLNS clearly identifies the growing scale of quantitative need in the period up to 2016 and the Appellant argues that allowing this scheme would bring about sustainability improvements by reducing trade leakage and travel distances for shopping trips. I do not find this argument compelling. Until the MCCP scheme is completed, Salisbury city centre is likely to continue failing to meet demand for higher-order comparison shopping and therefore this scheme should be the priority in planning terms, taking account of sustainability and consumer choice factors. Also, the forecasts of high levels of over-trading on the existing retail warehouse parks in Salisbury do not seem a good argument for permitting further out-of-centre development as in this case.

Sequential Approach

19. It was agreed at the Inquiry that the only sequentially preferable site to the appeal site is the land at MCCP. In regard to its availability and other matters, evidence was given to the Inquiry on behalf of Harvest Ltd Partnership (Harvest), which owns the long leasehold on the Maltings shopping centre. Harvest envisages that the scheme will open in December 2013, a year earlier than indicated in the SV.

20. Compared with other large town centre schemes this is a short timescale that allows little or no margin for slippage and in some respects appears very ambitious. Nonetheless, a number of factors support a shorter timescale in this case. The Council and Harvest own virtually the whole of the site and Harvest is a joint venture company formed by Land Securities Plc and J Sainsburys Plc. It seems unlikely that compulsory purchase procedures will be

required to any significant extent, and there is good reason to expect that one of the key anchors (Sainsburys as the foodstore operator) is almost secured. Detailed technical work is already underway and while design and parking issues in particular will be sensitive, there appears to be no overriding technical reasons why the site cannot be brought forward in a reasonable period of time for the scale of development envisaged. While not pre-judging the outcome of the examination into the submission Core Strategy, it seems to me that based on the public consultation and technical work already undertaken, there can be reasonable confidence in progressing detailed proposals for the scheme in parallel with the examination.

21. On the balance of all the evidence on availability, I conclude that there are reasonable grounds for expecting MCCP to come forward well before the Appellant's suggested opening date in 2017-2019. If the opening date were to slip beyond Harvest's prediction to 2014 (the SV expected date) or 2015, this would still seem to be reasonable availability, given the size of the intended scheme and its importance for Salisbury, and this appears to be achievable.

22. Turning to the issue of suitability, I consider that almost all of the potential occupiers listed by the Appellant could trade from the MCCP site since these retailers either already trade from town centres or could do so even if they chose not to. Furniture, represented by DFS on the Appellant's list may be an exception, although the proposed department store and other large floorplate units in MCCP could sell furniture and other bulky goods such as large electrical items. Therefore, having regard to the advice in paragraphs 3.15-3.18 of PPS6, I consider that MCCP should be regarded as a suitable alternative site for most if not all of the proposed elements of the appeal scheme, and the scale of the latter could readily be accommodated on MCCP.

23. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would not be viable on MCCP. The viability of the MCCP scheme itself is not capable of public scrutiny, and I understand the Appellant's concern about the degree of trust sought on this matter and the basis for the Council's late change of stance on the sequential status of MCCP. However, given the current stage of the scheme, the information available supports a reasonable expectation that a viable redevelopment scheme will be brought forward. I have no reason to doubt the evidence that the feasibility study indicates that there is likely to be sufficient occupier demand to support the scale and content of the scheme. Detailed investigation of asset values, their saleability and availability for release to fund this and other key parts of the SV is underway but lack of such information at this stage is not critical in my view. There are uncertainties as a result of current economic circumstances but these are not unique to MCCP.

24. Overall, I conclude that MCCP is a more central site that is suitable and viable for the nature and scale of the appeal proposal and that it is likely to be available within a reasonable period of time.

Impact on Other Centres

25. There is no dispute that it is the impact on Salisbury city centre that is of concern in this appeal. As PPS6 advises in paragraph 3.22, there are a range of factors that should be taken into account in assessing impact, including the extent to which the spatial planning strategy for the area and for a particular

centre would be put at risk. In my view this requires an element of qualitative judgement, having regard to the particular circumstances of each case. The SV's proposal for MCCP does not yet form part of an adopted Core Strategy, but there can be very little doubt about its major importance for the future well-being of the wider area. In the light of the policy background I consider that it should be treated as part of the spatial planning strategy for the purposes of this appeal.

26. I note firstly that the Council's reason for refusal was about the danger of larger retailers moving out of the city centre to the appeal scheme, but its case and that of Harvest at the Inquiry concentrated on the danger of not attracting larger retailers into the MCCP scheme. This approach seems reasonable, given the small number of large unit retailers already in the city centre and the substantive evidence about the importance of attracting high street multiple retailers in order to claw back trade from strongly competing centres. Also, as the difference between the small Next store in Salisbury city centre and its much larger outlet on a retail warehouse park on Southampton Road illustrates, it is unlikely that retailers would maintain the same level of presence in a town centre scheme and an out-of-centre development.

27. It would be difficult to argue that the appeal scheme would, if permitted, completely undermine the MCCP scheme but in my view it would be likely to have a number of harmful effects. In particular, there is a real and significant danger that it would cause unacceptable delay in the implementation of MCCP by deterring potential occupiers, providing a competing attraction for retailers who might otherwise take up units in MCCP. Pre-lets are likely to be very important for the successful early implementation of MCCP, and there are a limited number of retail tenants available, particularly for the medium to large floorplate units that are a key part of the MCCP's concept.

28. The appeal scheme's non-bulky goods element would account for over 5,000 sq m of floorspace, the estimated equivalent of four or five large units in MCCP. Five of the six potential occupiers listed by the Appellant represent the type of retail offer for which MCCP would be in competition. Moreover, in difficult economic circumstances this is likely to be an even more significant factor and there is a real danger that the delivery of MCCP would be set back by the `soft option' of the appeal scheme. For these reasons, I consider that the appeal scheme would put the planning strategy for Salisbury city centre at significant risk.

29. With regard to the second bullet point of paragraph 3.22, and given the scale of the MCCP scheme, its importance to Salisbury, and current economic circumstances which are unlikely to assist retail schemes in getting `off the ground', every effort should be made to support the confidence of private and public sector investors in MCCP. Granting permission for a substantial element of non-bulky comparison goods retailing on the appeal site would not in my view engender such confidence, and Harvest's participation in the Inquiry supports this view. This investment is necessary to safeguard the vitality and viability of the city centre for the reasons set out above. Also, other important public realm improvements to the city centre will be delayed by any material slippage of the MCCP scheme.

30. So far as the other criteria in paragraph 3.22 of PPS6 are concerned, the Appellant has indicated that in a worst case scenario, the appeal scheme would have a 5% impact on Salisbury city centre. Even at this level I accept that in quantitative terms this is unlikely to be harmful, but neither this nor any absence of direct conflict with the other criteria of paragraph 3.22 overcomes my concerns about the particular impacts set out above. Also, PPS6 advises that the identification of need does not necessarily mean that there will be no negative impact; in any event, there is insufficient evidence of a quantitative need for both the appeal scheme and MCCP in the next five-seven years approximately, and the qualitative need will be addressed by MCCP. Overall, I conclude that the appeal scheme would have an unacceptable impact on Salisbury city centre.

31. In reaching this conclusion I have taken into account GVA Grimley's review of the Applicant's Supplementary Retail Report and the extent of its support for the appeal scheme. However, the review focused on the availability of sites to meet the identified need up to 2011 (the design year for the appeal scheme), but the Inquiry evidence leads me to conclude that MCCP should be regarded as `available' in PPS6 terms and accorded considerable importance in the planning strategy for the area.

32. Also, GVA Grimley's endorsement is qualified, provided that the appeal scheme is "…substantially restricted to the sale of bulky goods or at the very least, to the preferred scheme tested by the Applicant." But for the reasons set out above I am not satisfied that the preferred scheme can be relied upon to protect against adverse impact on the city centre since much of its retail offer would compete with town centre retailing. Also, there is good reason to doubt that the potential occupiers of the relevant units could satisfy the suggested planning condition about the minimum percentage floorspace for bulky goods.

33. Furthermore, there is no evidence that another tenant mix which could comply with the suggested condition is likely to be forthcoming. The fact that the condition has been used for other out-of-centre schemes is not a sufficient endorsement, and given all of the above, it would not be reasonable to apply the condition on the basis that enforcement powers could deal with breaches.

34. I now move on to further material considerations, in particular the extant planning permission on the site, and whether the harm I have identified above could be overcome by imposition of other conditions.

The Fall Back Position

35. As referred to above, the extant planning permission has been implemented but it remains to be considered whether it is likely to be built out and how it would compare with the appeal scheme. The Appellant's evidence indicates that in the current economic climate it may take up to three years to pre-let the scheme and in my judgement it is most unlikely to be built without pre-lets. Also, the permission has not been taken up during a period of favourable trading conditions and it has been accepted that the design of the approved scheme is now dated and unlikely to suit occupiers' requirements. Accordingly, it seems very unlikely that the extant permission will be built out.

36. In any event, there are material differences between the permitted and appeal schemes in retail policy terms. The current appeal seeks permission for a

significantly larger development overall, of which over 5,000 sq m would be available for the sale of non-bulky items, whereas condition 15 of the permitted scheme restricts the range of goods that may be sold from any of the units. Difficulties of interpretation and enforcement may occur in regard to bulky goods conditions, but in my view the range of goods permitted by condition 15 is materially different from that which is now proposed, taking the appeal scheme as a whole into account, and a comparison on any other basis would not be meaningful. For all of these reasons I do not consider that the extant planning permission supports the grant of permission for the appeal scheme in the terms sought.

Conclusion on the First Issue and Scope for Planning Conditions

37. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal scheme would harm Salisbury city centre by damaging the prospects for the MCCP scheme which is seen as a vital element in protecting and enhancing Salisbury's role as a sub-regional shopping centre. It would not accord with Policy DP6 of the WSSP (which is more up-to-date than SDLP) or with the advice in PPS6. Policy S7 of the SDLP, which appears to allocate the site for unrestricted comparison goods retail development, carries only limited weight for the reasons set out above and I do not consider that it overrides the other considerations.

38. The Council has made clear however that in the light of Policy S7 and the planning history of the site it considers that a "truly bulky goods scheme" would be acceptable on this site. No substantive case has been made against this position and, in the light of all the evidence, I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in retail policy terms if planning conditions were to be imposed that restrict the range of goods to be sold to specified types of bulky goods, and restrict the minimum size of the units in order to secure the bulky goods character of the scheme. Draft conditions on these matters were agreed at the Inquiry.

Provision for Cycle and Pedestrian Access

39. There is no dispute that the proposed development would be generally accessible by a choice of transport modes, having regard to the advice in PPS6, Planning Policy Guidance note 13, *Transport* (PPG13) and the relevant development plan policies. But by the opening of the Inquiry one specific concern remained about the proposed route of the cycle and pedestrian connections with the wider area. The appeal scheme makes provision for a new footway and cycleway on its frontage on the north-western side of London Road and for its continuation onto Green Lane, via a new link along the southern boundary of the site. The existing section of footway on London Road that continues towards Bishopsdown roundabout is very narrow and there are concerns that cyclists would use this route, rather than the new link to Green Lane, thus endangering their own safety and that of others.

40. However, the new route via Green Lane would only be very marginally longer than the existing route on London Road and in my view it would be generally perceived as much more attractive, safe and convenient. Moreover, there are no other alternative routes that would offer the benefits of the appeal scheme's route. Taking all of the detailed proposals for the scheme into account, I

consider that it would meet the objectives of PPS6, PPG13 and the development plan policies for safe and sustainable access to new development.

Other Matters

41. I have taken into account the concerns of the Laverstock and Ford Parish Council, local residents and others about the traffic impact of this scheme and the cumulative effect of other development proposed in this area. These concerns are understandable, especially since the area has already witnessed considerable change and more growth is proposed. However the traffic and transport implications of the appeal scheme have been carefully assessed and the necessary measures and facilities for safe movement will be provided as part of the development. In some respects the appeal scheme will enable improvements, by better integration of cycle and pedestrian networks, enhanced public transport facilities and new traffic calming measures.

42. Concerns about the visual impact of the proposals, the effects on the amenities of local residents, increase in anti-social behaviour and other impacts have been noted fully, but I am not satisfied that the scheme would be harmful, subject to its implementation in accordance with the approved details and compliance with the planning conditions imposed. I have also taken account of Lothbury Property Trust's case about the benefits of its proposed expansion of retail warehouse development on Southampton Road compared with the appeal scheme, but it does not override the determining factors in this case.

Overall Conclusion

43. Taking all of these matters into account I consider that, while the proposed mix of bulky and non-bulky comparison goods retailing would be unacceptably harmful to Salisbury city centre, the development should be allowed subject to a bulky goods condition and one controlling the minimum size of the units. Also a number of other conditions as proposed by the Council and discussed at the Inquiry are necessary. These conditions on the detailed design and finishes of the scheme, hard and soft landscaping, environmental and other conservation measures, sustainable construction, provision of and control over cycle and car parking, servicing and related facilities, an acoustic barrier and other noise insulation measures, lighting, opening hours and delivery times, hours of construction, drainage, and archaeological investigation are necessary in the interests of the proper planning and development of the area. In the light of Circular 11/95 I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions in the interests of precision and relevance to the permission and have deleted the final sentence of the bulky goods condition in the interests of enforceability.

44. All of the other matters raised have been taken into account, but none of them outweigh the considerations that have led to my decision.

Mary Travers

Inspector

Schedule A: Planning Conditions

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted details of materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

3) No development shall take place until large scale (1:10) details of the windows/doors/entrance canopies have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4) No development shall take place until large scale details of the proposed bicycle parking have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved staff and users' car parking and bike spaces shall be made available prior to any of the retail units first coming into operation.

5) The acoustic barrier shall be designed with a minimum superficial density of 10kg/m2 and of minimum 3 metres in height. The barrier shall be fully erected prior to any of the retail units first coming into use, and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with a scheme of repair and maintenance to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the barrier being erected.

6) Before erection of any equipment on the buildings, there shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for insulation against noise emissions from extractor fans, compressor motors and all similar equipment. The approved scheme shall be implemented before any part of the development opens for trading. Any equipment proposed must be able to achieve a 35decibel (A) rating as outlined in the noise assessment report submitted with the planning application, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7) A scheme to restrict the removal of customer trolleys from the retail park site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the retail units first coming into operation. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

8) No development shall take place, including site clearance, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Nature Conservation Management Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which covers the following points:
a) Tree protection and retention along Green Lane and the southern boundary of the site;
b) A scheme for the assessment, protection and translocation of existing reptiles;
c) The provision of bird boxes on the proposed landscaping areas;
d) Lighting on site during construction and the control of light pollution;
e) The parking of all vehicles associated with construction within the confines of the site;

f) The protection of the aquifer, river system, ecology and adjacent residential uses from pollution during construction; and
g) The detailed management and maintenance of the enhanced landscaping areas.

9) A scheme for the lighting of the car park, cycle/footway, and the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the erection of any lighting on site. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

10). There shall be no site vegetation clearance between March-August inclusive, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a suitable wildlife survey of the site.

11) The retail units hereby permitted shall not be open to the public outside the following times:
Mondays to Saturdays – 07:00 hours to 21:00 hours
Sundays and Public Holidays – 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours

12) The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the internal layout of the 8 retail units shown on the plans hereby permitted, the minimum unit size being 929 sq. metres. There shall be no subdivision of any of the units or any additional internal floor space created (including any insertion of mezzanine floors) not covered by this permission.

13) Before the retail units hereby permitted are first brought into use, a scheme for the erection of operational solar panels on the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such thereafter.

14) No development shall take place until a scheme of landscaping for the site, including planting around the proposed cycle/footway along the southern boundary, and the screening of the acoustic fence, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including times of planting, species and size, and a long-term maintenance scheme. The landscaping shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

15) No development shall take place until details of the proposed hard landscaping/surfacing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out as approved.

16) No development shall take place until full details of the construction of a shared cycleway/footway along Pearce Way and London Road together with a new link between London Road and Green Lane, including new bus shelter, raised kerbs, any additional street lighting and all works contained within the existing public highway at the proposed access point, all as indicated on drawing number 1780/P/32S, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of the development.

17) Delivery of goods to the retail units shall not take place outside the following hours:
Monday to Friday – 07:00 hours to 20:00 hours
Saturday – 08:00 hours to 14:00 hours.
There shall be no deliveries to the retail units on Sundays and Public Holidays.

18) The hours of construction of the development hereby permitted shall be limited to the following times:
Monday to Friday – 07:00 hours to 18:00 hours
Saturday – 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours.
There shall be no construction work carried out on Sundays and Public Holidays.

19) No development shall take place until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the buildings hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the drainage scheme shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details. The scheme submitted shall limit surface water run-off, and shall involve safe management and on-site storage of surface water in excess of the design capacity of the drainage system.

20) No development shall take place until a scheme for water efficiency has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

21) Notwithstanding the provisions of Class B of Part 4 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the areas set aside for car parking and servicing ancillary to the associated retail units shall be used for that purpose only.

22) No development shall take place until the Applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

23) The development hereby permitted shall achieve a BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environment Assessment Method) rating of `very good'. No unit shall be occupied until the post-construction stage assessment and subsequent BREEAM Certificate certifying that `very good' status has been achieved has been issued.

24) The range and type of goods to be sold from the non-food retail units hereby permitted shall be restricted to the following: DIY and/or garden goods; furniture, carpets and floor coverings; camping, boating and caravanning goods; motor vehicle and cycle goods; and bulky electrical goods.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr R Harris, Queen's Counsel	-	instructed by Indigo Planning Ltd.
He called:		
Mr M Axon FIHT MTPS	-	Savell Bird and Axon, 74A Charlotte Street, London W1T 4QJ
Mr S McGrath BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI		Indigo Planning Ltd, Swan Court, Worple Road, London SW19 4JS.

FOR SALISBURY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Ms Z Leventhal of Counsel	-	instructed by Head of Legal and Property Services, Salisbury District Council.
She called:		
Mr P Dance DipTP MRTPI	-	Planning Consultant, 11 North Street, Stoke sub Hamdon, Somerset TA14 6QQ.
Mr C Rusell-Smith BSc FRICS	-	Alder King, Pembroke House, 15 Pembroke Road, Bristol BS8 3BA.
Mr G Eves BSc MICE MIHT	-	PFA Consulting, Stratton Park House, Wanborough Road, Swindon SN3 4HG.

FOR HARVEST LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Ms N Lieven, Queen's Counsel	-	instructed by Denton Wilde Sapte, 1 Fleet Place, London EC4M 7WS.
She called:		
Mr J Stephenson BSc MURP DipSurveying MRTPI MRICS	-	Montagu Evans, Clarges House,6-12 Clarges Street, London W1J8HB.

INTERESTED PERSONS

Laverstock and Ford Parish Council, represented by Cllr A Markham (Chairman), 13 Woodland Way, Laverstock, Salisbury SP1 1SB.

Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd, represented by Mr M McFarland, Turley Associates, Brunswick House, Brunswick Place, Southampton SO15 2AP.

DOCUMENTS FROM THE INQUIRY

1. Attendance List
2. Letter of notification of the Inquiry
3. Statement on behalf of Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd.

Documents put in by Ms Leventhal

4. Chronology of publications, decisions, public consultations etc.
5. Corrected Appendix 4 to Mr Dance's proof of evidence
6. The Salisbury Vision
7. Planning Brief 2001 for the MCCP site
8. Note from Mr E Teagle on the proposed redevelopment of MCCP
9. Extract from the Proposals Map, SDLP
10. Response note from Mr Eves
11. Summary proof of evidence of Mr Charles Russell-Smith
12. Secretary of State's Direction Letter on saved policies.
13. Schedule of proposed saved policies submitted by the Council to the Secretary of State
14. Extract from report by Mr G Gould to the Salisbury Vision Steering Group on public consultation July-October 2007
15. Draft condition on bulky/non bulky goods
16. Draft condition on bulky goods only
17. Opening and Conclusion submissions

Documents put in by Ms Lieven

18. Rebuttal proof of Mr Stephenson
19. Appeal decision on B&Q, Will Adams Way, Gillingham, Kent
20. Extract from Topic Paper 8, Addendum
21. Vision for Salisbury, Area Development Framework, Final Report, April 2007
22. Opening and Closing Submissions

Documents put in by Mr Harris

23. S106 Planning Obligation
24. Agreed Statement on the road lowering works at St Thomas's bridge
25. Extract from Proposed Modifications to the SDLP September 2002
26. Revised Table 4b, GVA Grimley assessment of capacity amended to include increase in market share

27. Tables of Bulky/Comparison Goods areas
28. Drawing No W93768/A/01 dated 23.02.09 showing foot and cycle links
29. Appeal decision on land SE of Papworth Bungalow, Wisbech Road, March
30. Briefing note on floorspace in Salisbury town centre
31. Letter dated 16.12.08 from Ms J Ferguson, Salisbury District Council, to Indigo Planning Ltd
32. Statement of Common Ground between Wiltshire County Council and Savell Bird and Axon, February 2009
33. Opening and Closing Submissions