



# South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Topic Paper 3 Addendum 2:

*Sustainable Settlement Strategy*

July 2009

# **WILTSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

## **TOPIC PAPER 3 ADDENDUM 2**

### **SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENT STRATEGY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**JULY 2009**

---

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 ANALYSIS OF SETTLEMENTS IN SOUTH WILTSHIRE
- 3.0 SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION
- 4.0 BASIS OF DISPERSAL OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
- 5.0 DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING
- 6.0 INDICATIVE LEVELS OF HOUSING BY COMMUNITY AREA
- 7.0 INDICATIVE LEVELS OF HOUSING BY LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE
- 8.0 COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED LEVELS OF HOUSING

#### **APPENDICES**

- 1: BASIC FACILITIES MATRIX
- 2: BASIC FACILITIES IN SALISBURY SSCT
- 3: BASIC FACILITIES IN AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA
- 4: BASIC FACILITIES IN DOWNTON COMMUNITY AREA
- 5: BASIC FACILITIES IN MERE COMMUNITY AREA
- 6: BASIC FACILITIES IN TISBURY COMMUNITY AREA
- 7: BASIC FACILITIES IN WILTON COMMUNITY AREA
- 8: HOUSING DISTRIBUTION CALCULATIONS IN SIMPLIFIED FORM
- 9: DRAFT CORE STRATEGY POLICY
- 10: CHANGES TO DRAFT POLICY AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING REFINEMENT

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In June 2007 Salisbury District Council published Local Development Framework Topic Paper 3 'Settlement Strategy' ("The Topic Paper"). In February 2008, following consultation on options put forward within The Topic Paper, the Council published an Addendum to the Topic Paper ("The Addendum").
- 1.2 This second addendum should be read in conjunction with both The Topic Paper and The Addendum and it is not therefore considered necessary to repeat background information, national and regional policy, examples of best practice and community aspirations contained therein in detail.
- 1.3 The core objectives in formulating a Settlement Strategy were to develop a set of planning policies, which contribute to the following patterns of land use:
- Social progress, which recognises the needs of everyone.
  - Effective protection of the environment.
  - Prudent use of natural resources.
  - Maintenance of high economic growth and employment.
- 1.4 The Topic Paper identified the following as Key Issues in determining the Settlement Strategy:
- How should the long-term strategy for the district respond to regional and national factors?
  - Has the approach to roles and functions of settlements been "about right"?
  - What other factors should be taken into account?
  - In future, what should be the broad role for settlements in each of the groupings identified?
  - Should most new development be targeted in the larger settlements with the best access to facilities?
  - What role is there for using development to deliver important services to settlements currently with a shortage of them?

### **Issues and Options**

- 1.5 The suggestions listed above were included within the council's 'Our Place In The Future' Issues and Options consultation carried out in the summer of 2007.
- 1.6 The Addendum reviewed The Topic Paper, analysed the results of the public consultation on these options and examined relevant individual comments to ascertain if there were any additional areas that required investigation prior to preparation of Preferred Options for this topic.

- 1.7 In relation to Settlement Strategy Issues and Options, a total of eleven questions were asked in the consultation document, in a format asking respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with an Option as phrased. Overall there was a positive response, with 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' receiving the highest numbers of responses in all but one instance. However, individuals provided a wide range of comments supplementary to the simplistic agree/disagree option; and this yielded a wide range of concerns and questions. Principally these appeared to stem from the level of new development allocated to the district in the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West ("RSS").

### **Preferred Options**

- 1.8 The proposals identified above were subjected to a number of tests including sustainability appraisal, deliverability and conformity with national and regional policy. As a result The Addendum identified the following as proposals that should be taken forward by the Council:
- Make places more sustainable.
  - Create a policy focusing development at settlements with the best range of facilities, services, transport and job opportunities.
  - Develop a policy that locates "most" development at Salisbury, whose role as the district's hub is protected, and enhanced now, being a regional SSCT ('Strategically Significant City Or Town' as defined by the RSS).
  - Identify Amesbury, supported by the two 'satellites' of Durrington and Bulford, as a unique urban group of settlements within the district, to be considered as the most important hub for growth in the district outside of Salisbury in a joined-up strategy, with new jobs created at Solstice Park, Porton Down and the garrisons, and regeneration of the town as a priority.
  - Classify Mere, Tisbury, Wilton and Downton as "Local Centres" (a third tier in the hierarchy) to accommodate growth to help meet the needs of the surrounding "community areas".
  - Identify Alderbury, Dinton, Hindon, Laverstock, Morgan's Vale/Woodfalls, Porton, Shrewton, The Winterslows, Whiteparish, Winterbourne Dauntsey/Earls/Hurdcott, and Zeals as fourth-tier "Main Villages" to accommodate a limited amount of appropriate growth, to enable existing services and facilities to be safeguarded.
  - Make no housing allocations other than allowing for exceptional rural affordable housing where there is an identified local need and an acceptable site. Retain settlement boundaries in larger villages with sufficient access to services and facilities so that new infill development would not generate excessive reliance on the car.
  - Have a Core Strategy policy that respects the identity of villages and does not falsely merge or urbanise them. Where settlements are linear or dispersed, further development would not necessarily contribute to sustainability objectives and therefore closer scrutiny is required instead of a blanket approach.

- 1.9 The Council carried out consultation on a wide range of Core Strategy Preferred Options in the spring of 2008, of which those referred to below were of relevance to this topic.
- 1.10 The Golden Threads listed under Preferred Option PO1 identified that we should deliver ‘managed growth which is balanced with conservation and infrastructure’.
- 1.11 The Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives listed under Preferred Option PO3 included Objective B: ‘Where south Wiltshire has agreed the role and functions of its settlements, and is comfortable with how places are evolving and are related to each other’.
- 1.12 Under Preferred Option PO6 we proposed that the growth levels required, to contribute to thriving and prosperous communities, should be delivered in a managed way to ensure:
- Development that benefits and supports existing communities, and does not overwhelm or undermine them.
  - Distribution growth in proportion to the scale of existing settlements.
  - New buildings appropriate to their context and avoiding creating faceless, bland “sprawl”.
  - Avoiding convergence of settlements with each other, particularly with Salisbury.
  - Locating key facilities close to where people live to minimise need to travel.
  - Providing the necessary affordable housing.
  - Contributing to the ongoing viability of services in settlements.
  - Not overloading facilities and contributes to infrastructure, i.e. roads.
  - Linking and balancing housing development more closely with that of jobs
- 1.13 Under Preferred Option PO7 we proposed a settlement strategy based on delivering managed growth to the main existing settlements, to provide an accessible and sustainable pattern of development. This settlement strategy would be based on the following hierarchy of settlements:
- Salisbury as the primary service centre because of the level of services, shops, jobs and homes it provides.
  - Amesbury, supported by Durrington and Bulford, as a unique group of settlements with a good level of services supported by employment.
  - Tisbury, Wilton, Downton and Mere, which are important local centres that provide a good level of services to their surrounding areas, where modest growth would help keep them viable in their own right and maintain that wider role.
  - Main villages of Alderbury, Dinton, Hindon, Laverstock, Morgan’s Vale and Woodfalls, Porton, Shrewton, The Winterslows, Whiteparish, Winterbourne Dauntsey, Earls and Hurdcott and Zeals, which provide

a good level of local services and facilities and where growth should be supported where it helps to protect that role.

- Secondary villages, with small populations and limited services, which should receive only incremental growth, i.e. small infill sites.
- “Clusters” of settlements, which will be investigated further at the Site-Specific Allocations stage, to identify whether they would be appropriate locations for modest growth where this safeguards the viability of the facilities they collectively provide.

1.14 43% of respondents supported the list of Golden Threads identified under PO1. A further 33% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that delivering managed growth balanced with conservation and infrastructure formed part of a list, and none of the 24% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle.

1.15 Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with suggestions as to additional Golden Threads and how other Preferred Options would impact on those already identified, principally in terms of the level of new development proposed in the district. Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I oppose this option because it does not mention the protection of our green belt and strategic gap land that surrounds the city.
- The Golden Threads do not include climate change and adaptation to climate change.
- The [Parish] Council agrees that your policy work should be underpinned by the Golden Threads as listed.
- The aspirations are sound as long as Government intervention doesn't override managed growth and impose its own aims.
- The core values and assets identified to be respected in development of policies and proposals are comprehensive and relevant and will provide for district wide and locally appropriate policies.
- The Golden Threads are all common sense objectives.
- The whole document seeks to undermine the qualities which make south Wiltshire special.

1.16 23% of respondents supported the list of Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives identified under PO3. A further 49% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that the objective relating to the role and functions of settlements formed part of a list and none of the 28% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle.

1.17 Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with the wording of policies and the impact of major development in the south Wiltshire area. Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I support the objectives but I do not believe SDC has appropriate policies for achieving it. More of the same will worsen not improve the environment.
- Objectives are admirable. We hope that B is really fully investigated before it is realised.
- The vision and strategic objectives need to be clear with regard to the residential growth requirements, housing need and the sustainable location for development within the district.
- We agree with statements A-L for the Core Strategy Spatial Vision in general.
- The figure of 12400 new homes is not written in stone and is merely a 'suggested' figure, and as such is unreliable and must be reviewed.
- I find that all the objectives A through L are easy to completely agree with - I just hope that they prove to be achievable.
- This is all a lot of nonsense, my opinion will not matter, they will be done whatever us people say.
- Why do you need to build 12400 homes in south Wiltshire? Why is this required? I object to this idea strenuously as it will massively alter the nature of those areas ear marked for development.
- I agree that points A-L will help meet the forthcoming challenges.

1.18 58% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO7 to identify a settlement strategy based on delivering managed growth to the main existing settlements, to provide an accessible and sustainable pattern of development. A further 12% neither supported nor objected to the Preferred Option, but rather made comment on its content.

1.19 Analysis of comments made by the 30% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with the position of individual settlements within the proposed hierarchy and the implications for those settlements in terms of anticipated growth. Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Shrewton is not a main village. It has a school, two shops, a garage and three pubs.
- Firsdown is a small rural hamlet, consisting of approximately 200 bungalows and any large number of houses would completely destroy this type of habitation.
- Preferred Option 7 is supported, as it is clear that Salisbury (including its outer areas like Laverstock) is the most sustainable location for new housing within the district, and most new housing should be located there.
- Downton does not provide a good level of service to the existing population and simply cannot cope with any further development, either within Downton or in the surrounding villages.
- With respect to Mere, this is an important local service centre that also provides a good level of services to its surrounding area.
- No, Tisbury isn't a good place to develop. It's road system is weak and it is too far from 'A' roads and large towns\cities.

- I cannot agree that the village of Whiteparish can be said to provide a good level of local services in relation to public transport.
- Support the identification of Whiteparish as a main village: Whiteparish can accommodate further residential development through small-scale urban extensions.
- ‘Clusters’ sharing access to facilities in neighbouring villages already cause major obstruction with parking (i.e. Winterbourne shop and Porton shop).
- Support the hierarchy of settlements based on population, amenities and services.

### **Evolved Preferred Options**

- 1.20 The council undertook a second stage of Preferred Options consultation in the autumn of 2008. The consultation document suggested that for the first five years of the Core Strategy, new houses should be focused on sites around Salisbury and Amesbury as these have the best range of services and facilities. During the remainder of the plan period, housing development should be shared throughout existing settlements, as well as Salisbury and Amesbury at a level based on their services, job opportunities and character.
- 1.21 In response to the question ‘Do you agree with the ‘dispersed growth’ approach?’ 54% of respondents answered ‘yes’ and 46% ‘no’. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with the level of new development allocated to the district in the RSS and the implications for individual settlements in terms of anticipated growth.
- 1.22 For those disagreeing with the ‘dispersed growth’ option, the opportunity to suggest alternative approaches was put forward. Few alternatives were proposed, but the following provides comment on some that were:
- Placing more emphasis on building additional dwellings in villages would not meet the same level of existing, immediate housing need as would identifying larger, strategic sites in Salisbury and Amesbury.
  - Relying on infill or windfall sites is not a strategic approach.
  - A new settlement had been suggested as one of our original Preferred Options. However, analysis of consultation responses at that stage, including from Statutory Consultees, strongly disagreed with that suggestion, and the Council did therefore take it forward.
- 1.23 Other comments made by respondents included the following:
- Settlements other than Salisbury and Amesbury will need to be built up to ensure that facilities there now remain viable.
  - Tell the Government to put their new houses somewhere else. There is no room here.
  - There is no point in building homes in villages where there is no shop or local school etc.

- I am concerned with the projected housing requirements stated for the village areas.
- Spread new houses throughout the area - not only Salisbury and Amesbury.
- For South Wiltshire to survive, there needs to be NO new building in the small villages that give that part of the county its character.
- As well as the bulk of housing being as you suggest, you should also include a very few (one-three) houses per village and hamlet, particularly small homes to keep all villages and hamlets viable.
- Plus more small developments NOW in medium sized villages to support the local infrastructure.
- Housing development should be shared throughout ALL existing settlements.
- Focus only on Salisbury and Amesbury.
- Some areas may not be able to take a lot of housing for lack of infrastructure.
- Dispersed yes, but not so many.

### **Review of Settlement Strategy**

- 1.24 There was general support in principle for our approach to a settlement strategy. However, feedback on our proposals, including from Statutory Consultees, as well as advice received as part of the Planning Inspectorate LDF Frontloading project, suggested that proposed levels of development in the rural areas of the district might be reassessed, particularly in terms of infrastructure and access to services.
- 1.25 In order to achieve this we have undertaken a rigorous review of both our settlement strategy and of our proposals as to how levels of development should be dispersed across the Community Areas.

## **2.0 ANALYSIS OF SETTLEMENTS IN SOUTH WILTSHIRE**

### **Parameters for Analysis**

- 2.1 There are in excess of 100 settlements in the south Wiltshire area, ranging from the regionally significant centre of Salisbury, through towns and large villages to smaller villages and hamlets. For the purposes of The Topic Paper analysis, all settlements were considered which were either:
- Included in the Wiltshire County Council Rural Facilities Survey 2005 (“RFS”), or;
  - Designated with a Housing Policy Boundary (“HPB”), Housing Restraint Area or Special Restraint Area under the Salisbury District Local Plan (Adopted June 2003).
- 2.2 This was with the exception of where HPBs effectively blend with that of Salisbury, including Lower Bemerton, Stratford-sub-Castle and Laverstock. In these cases the settlements were included with the city for the purposes of the strategy. This was not intended as a commentary or judgement on the identity of these settlements as places in their own right, but rather a reflection of how functionally interconnected they are with Salisbury.
- 2.3 Other settlements were not considered as, with relatively small populations and physical extents they are indistinguishable from the open countryside for the purposes of strategic planning.
- 2.4 We have reviewed this approach and consider it to have been appropriate.
- 2.5 Part of the administrative area of the council is under the jurisdiction of the New Forest National Park Authority (“NPA”) for planning purposes. Settlements within this area were included within The Topic Paper analysis but have now been excluded, as spatial planning in these locations is the responsibility of the NPA.

### **Facilities in Settlements**

- 2.6 The availability of services and important facilities varies with the range in size of settlements across the district. This is the crucial factor in establishing the sustainability and viability of settlements, and the appropriateness or otherwise of allocating or allowing for development in different locations.
- 2.7 The Addendum recognised that focussing development in settlements with the best range of facilities, services, transport and job opportunities should be an overriding principle of the Settlement Strategy and of housing and/or employment land allocations within the LDF, particularly at the level of Site-Specific Allocation (“SSA”).
- 2.8 Whilst, in general terms, population levels tend to correlate with levels of facilities, there are anomalies where populations have previously increased disproportionately to services and facilities. This is not considered to be a

sustainable approach and our review of the hierarchy of settlements seeks to prevent this arising in the future.

2.9 As with The Topic Paper, for the purposes of this analysis, the starting point for guidance as to levels of facilities was the RFS. This study reviewed comprehensively the existence of various community, transport and economic facilities in settlements across the district.

2.10 The RFS refers to three different categories of facility, which in turn were derived from the Wiltshire Structure Plans:

‘Basic Facilities’ comprise the following:

- Primary schools
- General food shops serving a range of daily needs
- Post Offices
- Journey to work public transport services

‘Community Facilities’ and ‘Other Facilities’ have a wider definition and include the following:

- Specialist food shops (for example a butcher’s or farm shop)
- Commercial Services
- Banks
- Petrol Filling Stations
- Mobile Services
- Recreation Facilities
- Places Of Worship
- Public Halls
- Public Houses
- Libraries
- Surgeries

2.11 It can be seen from this that ‘Basic Facilities’ could be considered principal factors in the function and role of a settlement in providing services to other, smaller, settlements within a Community Area. Whilst Community and Other Facilities are also a factor, it is considered that Basic Facilities are more essential to day-to-day living.

2.12 For this reason we have also included secondary schools as a Basic Facility in our review. None of the settlements that the RFS dealt with have a secondary school, although these are found in higher-level settlements.

2.13 The following facilities listed separately in the RFS have not been included as a Basic Facility in our review for the reasons stated:

- Post Office linked with Shop (it was considered inappropriate to count a Post Office linked to a General Food Shop as a second Basic Facility as, in reality, a community would be likely to view it as a single entity);

- Food Sales and other services within Petrol Filling Stations (it was considered inappropriate to count these as more than one facility as, in reality, a community would view them as a single entity);
- 2.14 In undertaking this review we have carried out a rigorous assessment, based on our own research and local knowledge, of the numbers of Basic Facilities listed in the RFS, in order to ensure a consistency of approach in the case of each settlement. Although this did not fundamentally alter the RFS figures, there were individual cases where, in our view, Basic Facility figures were inconsistent or anomalous.
- 2.15 Examples of this included Barford St Martin and Petersfinger. The latter was identified in the RFS as having a general food shop. It is assumed that this referred to the Tesco Supermarket in Southampton Road, which in our view should rightly be counted as a facility of Salisbury city. Barford St Martin was identified in the RFS as having two general food stores which, in reality, are a farm shop and an element of a petrol filling station, both of which we consider should be categorised as ‘Community Facilities’.
- 2.16 The RFS did not provide figures for facilities in Salisbury, Amesbury, Downton, Durrington, Mere, Tisbury or Wilton and we have therefore used our own research and local knowledge to assess numbers of Basic Facilities in these settlements.
- 2.17 The numbers and type of Basic Facilities we have identified in each settlement are set out in matrix and list form in Appendices 1 to 7.

### **3.0 SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION**

- 3.1 The Topic Paper set out a hierarchy of settlements based on the number of Basic and Community Facilities related both to one another and to population.
- 3.2 Paragraph 36 of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (“PPS3”) sets out the Government’s policy that new housing should be developed in suitable locations, which offer a range of facilities and have good access to key services and infrastructure. There is no indication that the existing population of a settlement should be a consideration in assessing the suitability of locations for development.
- 3.3 Taking this into account, our review of the Settlement Strategy is such that we do not consider existing population to be a crucial factor in assessing the sustainable location of new development.
- 3.4 As indicated in paragraph 2.11, it is considered that Basic Facilities are more essential to day-to-day living than Community and Other Facilities. Furthermore, we have found that a lower-level settlement may have a relatively large number of Community and Other Facilities, but in reality does not function as a centre for other settlements.
- 3.5 Examples of this include Charlton-All-Saints (in the Southern Community Area) and South Newton (Four Rivers Community Area), which are identified in the RFS as having 12 and 23 Community and Other Facilities respectively, but only 1 Basic Facility each.
- 3.6 Taking this into account, our review of the Settlement Strategy is such that we do not consider the provision of Community or Other Facilities to be a crucial factor in assessing the sustainable location of new development.
- 3.7 It is considered that the availability of Basic Facilities correlates to the status, function and role of settlements and this view is supported by the fact that there tends to be a concentration of such facilities within settlements that provide a degree of servicing to a hinterland. The revised Settlement Strategy and figures for dispersal of development are therefore based solely on the existing availability of Basic Facilities.
- 3.8 This approach is supported by paragraph 3.5.1 of the RSS, which recognises that the rural areas of the South West contain small towns and villages with widely different characteristics and relationships with other settlements and the surrounding countryside. We believe that, for the purposes of the Settlement Strategy, the comparison between available Basic Facilities provides the most appropriate means by which to distinguish between these characteristics and relationships.
- 3.9 We have found that the ranking of some individual settlements in The Topic Paper do not correspond with the findings of our review. These changes are noted in each case. We also feel it is appropriate to revise the criteria and

descriptions for lower level settlements, and have explained this where necessary.

### **Salisbury**

- 3.10 Salisbury is a city of regional significance that offers employment, high quality cultural facilities and shopping opportunities, which exceed those of similar and larger sized settlements.
- 3.11 Salisbury is listed in Development Policy A of the Regional Spatial Strategy (“RSS”) as a Strategically Significant City or Town (“SSCT”). With a population in excess of 44000 the city is indisputably the primary service, economic and cultural centre for south Wiltshire, and its influence also stretches into parts of Hampshire and Dorset.
- 3.12 Salisbury forms a hub in the rail and road network stretching into a wide hinterland. Three of the district’s eight ‘Strategically Important’ employment sites identified in the Employment Land Review (“ELR”) are located in the Salisbury area (at Old Sarum, Southampton Road and Churchfields), while a fourth site (at UKLF HQ) is located nearby at Wilton.
- 3.13 Because of the existing range of services and facilities available, the city will remain the focal point for development in the district. The main challenge is to accommodate the necessary development without damaging the character and setting that makes Salisbury unique.
- 3.14 The Addendum supported the development of a policy to locate the bulk of new development at Salisbury, with the protection of the city’s character, heritage and assets alongside the delivery of required infrastructure being a vital priority.

### **Amesbury and The Garrison Villages**

- 3.15 Along with Durrington, Bulford and their associated military garrisons, Amesbury heads a unique group of settlements within the district, which have close links to one another and collectively make up a large population – approaching half that of the city of Salisbury.
- 3.16 Amesbury is by some considerable margin the second largest settlement in the district, with a population of almost 9000 in 2001 and significant growth since that date, and provides a good range of services and facilities to a hinterland. The town is very close to, and strongly linked with, Durrington, Bulford village and large military camps at Larkhill and Bulford, which together have a combined population of around 11800.
- 3.17 Although these settlements are distinct from one another, their functions and proximity to one another mean that collectively they form a unique grouping within the district, neither conforming to the SSCT category nor being directly comparable with the Local Service Centres or any of the Village categories.

- 3.18 The Amesbury area is identified as a major node of growth for employment. Two of the eight ‘Strategically Important’ ELR employment sites are located at the town (at Solstice Park and Boscombe Down). Amesbury will continue to see major housing and employment development, which was originally proposed to address changes brought about by the defence review of the 1990s.
- 3.19 The Stonehenge Community Area plan recognises that such development can help to achieve the aims of community, with particular regard to affordable housing and community facilities.
- 3.20 The Addendum supported the identification of Amesbury, Durrington and Bulford as a unique group of settlements, to be considered as the most important hub for growth in the district outside of Salisbury.

### **Local Service Centres**

- 3.21 The settlements of Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton fall within this category. These settlements all have populations in excess of 2000, which is noted by the Countryside Agency as the lower end of its ‘market town’ classification. We acknowledge that these settlements do not all host markets and are not all towns, but we consider that this reflects their relationship with a rural hinterland and their capacity to act as a centre for services.
- 3.22 Across Wiltshire as a whole, there is a grouping of settlements of around this size that historically provide local service ‘hubs’ for a surrounding area. These areas are recognised by the Council as ‘Community Areas’, which in the south of the county include Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton.
- 3.23 These four hubs each provide a good level of ‘everyday’ retail and services. A Retail and Leisure Needs Study carried out on behalf of the Council in 2006 (“RLNS”) indicates that each of these settlements has a food store, pharmacy and post office. They also each have a bank, library and a number of other specialised shops or services.
- 3.24 Each settlement also has at least one identified Employment Site under the ELR, with at least one further potential site identified for possible expansion. Typically there are good A-road connections from these settlements to Salisbury and/or to large towns outside of the district. Tisbury is an exception to this, although it has a railway station on the London to Exeter line.
- 3.25 Downton is the largest settlement in the county south of Salisbury and serves local communities between the city and Fordingbridge, further to the south. As well as Salisbury the village has strong relationships with the New Forest, Southampton and the Bournemouth and Poole areas. The A338 passes through the village and there is a significant area of employment land.
- 3.26 Mere is a large village on the western fringes of the district. Offering a range of facilities, it is an important centre for outlying villages to the west of the district, although supermarkets at Gillingham and Shaftesbury are placing

competitive pressure on local retailers and services. Mere is within the secondary school catchment area for Gillingham. In terms of accessibility, Mere sits adjacent to the A303 trunk road, which effectively provides a boundary with the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the north of the village.

- 3.27 There has been no take up of employment land allocated in Mere during the 1990s, and the Mere Parish Plan sets out aspirations that allocations for housing land should be balanced with employment opportunities and other infrastructure, and should accommodate the needs of local people, whilst being sympathetic to the character of the area, the natural environment and the social and economic viability of the settlement.
- 3.28 Tisbury is located within the Nadder Valley and provides services to a wide and sparsely populated area of the district. For its size the village is very well served with facilities including a sports centre and a mainline railway station. In terms of accessibility the station is a clear asset, but this is offset by poor road access.
- 3.29 The community of Tisbury is particularly concerned with maintaining the availability of local services and providing high quality employment uses, whilst limiting the impact of new development upon the surrounding landscape.
- 3.30 Wilton is a historic market town that has always faced the challenges of being in close proximity to Salisbury. The RLNS indicates that retailing is generally healthy, although there are concerns regarding the loss of shops to residential uses. A key issue for Wilton is its distinctiveness as a place in its own right and to reinforce its role as a local centre to the villages within the Wylde and Nadder valleys. A further challenge will be to compensate for the major loss of the UKLF HQ, which is scheduled to relocate in 2010.
- 3.31 The Addendum supported the classification of Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton as ‘Local Centres’ to accommodate growth to help meet the needs of their surrounding Community Areas. Detailed analysis of the local housing need and market in these areas was required.
- 3.32 It should be noted that because of the close functional relationships between Wilton and Salisbury, the two Community Areas have been dealt with as a single entity at some stages of the Core Strategy process. This was not intended as a commentary or judgement on the identity of Wilton as an important settlement and Local Service Centre in its own right, and the maintenance of a strategic gap between the built up areas of Wilton and Salisbury will be of paramount importance when considering the allocation of sites in this area.

### **Secondary Villages**

- 3.33 The Topic Paper criteria identified categories of ‘Main Villages’ and ‘Secondary Villages’ below Local Service Centres.

- 3.34 We have reviewed this and acknowledge that, as indicated in some concerns raised during consultation, the use of the term ‘Main Village’ might not suggest any significant difference, in terms of everyday use of language, from ‘Local Service Centre’. Furthermore, we have found that The Topic Paper criteria for both ‘Main Villages’ and ‘Secondary Villages’ was identified as being ‘All other settlements with all four Basic Facilities and populations of 500+’.
- 3.35 As stated in paragraph 3.3, we do not consider existing population to be a crucial factor in assessing the sustainable location of new development and bearing this, and the above paragraph in mind, we have merged these categories to form a single category of ‘Secondary Villages’, the criteria for which is ‘Other settlements with three or four Basic Facilities’. This category now comprises the following 16 settlements, split by Community Area and with former categories noted.

#### **Amesbury Community Area**

Porton	(formerly a Main Village)
Shrewton	(formerly a Main Village)
Tilshead	(formerly a Secondary Village)
The Winterbournes	

(Winterbourne Dauntsey, Winterbourne Earls and Hurdcott were formerly grouped as a Main Village with Winterbourne Gunner identified separately as a Secondary Village. Whilst the RFS made this distinction, we do not believe it to be appropriate given the relationship between the various parts of The Winterbournes).

#### **Downton Community Area**

Alderbury	(formerly a Main Village)
Coombe Bissett	(formerly a Secondary Village)
Morgan’s Vale/Woodfalls	(formerly a Main Village)
Pitton	(formerly a Secondary Village)
Whiteparish	(formerly a Main Village)
The Winterslows	(formerly a Main Village)

#### **Tisbury Community Area**

Fovant	(formerly a Secondary Village)
Hindon	(formerly a Main Village)
Ludwell	(formerly a Secondary Village)

#### **Wilton Community Area**

Broadchalke	(formerly a Secondary Village)
Dinton	(formerly a Main Village)
Great Wishford	(formerly a Secondary Village)

- 3.36 This group of settlements performs a complementary role to Local Service Centres. Each have a range of Basic Facilities and some have, or are in close proximity to, small sites identified in the ELR. The allocation of appropriately sized greenfield sites and/or the retention of designations permissive of limited infill development should be considered in these settlements. Local factors including landscape constraints, character, sensitivity and need will be important in assessing the extent and suitability of such sites within the SSA Development Plan Document (“DPD”).
- 3.37 The Addendum identified that ‘Main Villages’ (as identified in The Topic Paper) should be able to accommodate a limited amount of appropriate growth. As neither The Topic Paper nor The Addendum suggested specific numbers of dwellings for settlements below the level of Local Service Centre, it is considered that their re-designation as a result of our review will not significantly impact on the overall Core Strategy.

### **Small Villages**

- 3.38 As a result of our review we have found that a number of settlements have ‘dropped’ in ranking, but we nevertheless consider that their provision of Basic Facilities might support very low levels of development.
- 3.39 We have therefore introduced this additional category, the criteria for which is ‘Other settlements with two Basic Facilities’, comprising the following 14 settlements, again split by Community Area and with former categories noted.

### **Amesbury Community Area**

Figheledean/Ablington (formerly a Secondary Village)  
 Gomeldon (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)  
 Middle Woodford (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)  
 Newton Toney (formerly a Secondary Village)  
 Orcheston (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)

### **Downton Community Area**

Bodenham (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)  
 Britford (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)  
 Odstock (formerly in Smallest Settlements and Countryside)

### **Mere Community Area**

Zeals (formerly a Main Village)

### **Tisbury Community Area**

Chilmark (formerly a Secondary Village)

### **Wilton Community Area**

Barford St Martin (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Stapleford (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Steeple Langford (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Wylve (formerly a Secondary Village)

- 3.40 Given the relatively limited range of facilities in these settlements, there is no real scope for major development, but the retention of designations permissive of limited infill and exception development based on local need should be considered. Local factors including landscape constraints, character and sensitivity will again be important in assessing the extent and suitability of such sites within the SSA DPD.
- 3.41 The Addendum indicated that preparation of the SSA DPD would require further analysis of settlements below the 'Main Village' category (as identified in The Topic Paper) in order to identify where it would be appropriate to retain HPBs allowing only infill and 'windfall' development. Our review has taken steps towards making this distinction.

### **Smallest Settlements and The Countryside**

- 3.42 This category comprises the open countryside and the remaining 66 settlements considered in our review, in accordance with the parameters set out in paragraph 2.1, again split by Community Area and with former categories noted where necessary.

### **Amesbury Community Area**

Allington  
Boscombe  
Cholderton  
Firsdwn (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Great Durnford  
Idmiston  
Lake  
Lower Woodford  
Milston  
Netton  
Upper Woodford  
West Amesbury  
Wilsford

### **Downton Community Area**

Charlton All Saints  
East Grimstead  
Farley (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Ford (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Homington

Lopcombe Corner  
Newton  
Nunton (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Petersfinger  
West Dean (formerly a Secondary Village)  
West Grimstead (formerly a Secondary Village)

### **Mere Community Area**

Barker's Hill  
East Knoyle (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Huggler's Hole  
Kilminster  
Maiden Bradley (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Sedgehill  
Semley  
Stourton  
West Knoyle  
White Cross

### **Tisbury Community Area**

Ansty  
Berwick St John (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Berwick St Leonard  
Charlton  
Chicklade  
Chicksgrove  
Donhead St Andrew (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Donhead St. Mary (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Fonthill Bishop  
Fonthill Gifford  
Newtown/Pythouse  
Sutton Mandeville  
Sutton Row  
Swallowcliffe  
Tollard Royal

### **Wilton Community Area**

Alvediston  
Berwick St James  
Bishopstone (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Bowerchalke (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Burcombe  
Compton Chamberlayne  
Deptford  
Ebbesbourne Wake  
Fisherton de la Mere  
Hanging Langford

Netherhampton  
Quidhampton (formerly a Secondary Village)  
South Newton (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Stoford  
Stratford Tony  
Teffont Magna and Evias (formerly a Secondary Village)  
Winterbourne Stoke

- 3.43 These settlements have been identified within our review as inappropriate locations for sustainable growth. As a consequence the implication would be for policies restrictive of new development.

### **Clusters**

- 3.44 The Addendum identified the potential to consider developing policies specific to groups or ‘Clusters’ of settlements where, collectively, two or more villages become more sustainable by virtue of their very close proximity to one another, with a relatively large population and good shared base of services.

- 3.45 The specific examples suggested were:

- Winterbourne Dauntsey/Earls/Gunner, Hurdcott, Idmiston, Porton and Gomeldon.
- Morgan’s Vale/Woodfalls, Redlynch and Lover/Bohemia.
- Ludwell, Donhead St Andrew/St Mary and Charlton.
- Great Wishford, South Newton and Stoford.

- 3.46 However, this option has not been proceeded with as the suggested examples were based largely on combined populations and there is no analysis available of the functional relationships between the component settlements.

- 3.47 Furthermore, if the option of considering groups of settlements as a single entity were to be pursued, there is a risk of additional pressure on a single settlement to accommodate a proportion of development that would not correlate with its level of provision of Basic Facilities, resulting in a significant inconsistency in our Settlement Strategy.

#### **4.0 BASIS OF DISPERSAL OF DEVELOPMENT**

- 4.1 The suggested levels of development identified in previous documents have been based on taking the figures required by the RSS and dividing them according to a balance of existing facilities and populations in Community Areas.
- 4.2 As stated in section 2, we believe that population and Community and Other Facilities should not be considerations in determining how to deliver sustainable development. Furthermore, specifically with regard to housing numbers, we believe there should be a further level of calculation to show how the findings of a Local Housing Needs and Market Survey (“HNMS”), carried out on behalf of the Council in 2006, have been taken into account, as well as the additional requirements of the RSS.
- 4.3 We have previously expressed an opinion that dispersing development across the district would be likely to help increase the number of facilities available in rural areas. We have reviewed this approach and find there is no strong evidence to support this. Therefore, the sustainable dispersal of development should be based on the existing situation, rather than predictions of a resultant increase in facilities.
- 4.4 Advice received as part of the Planning Inspectorate LDF Frontloading project supports this revised approach, as does paragraph 3.53 of the RSS, which states that ‘evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline and could result in increasing dependence on other centres, requiring access by car in the absence of viable public transport alternatives in many rural areas’.
- 4.5 The calculations included in section 5 and 6 are presented in a simplified form in Appendix 8.

## 5.0 DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING

### Identified Local Needs

- 5.1 The HNMS identified the following rural housing needs in the district, divided into Community Areas:

Community Area	Private Need	Affordable Need	Total Need
Salisbury	2895	1073	3968
Amesbury	773	407	1180
Downton	547	131	678
Tisbury	271	133	404
Mere	111 (*)	100	211 (*)
Wilton	626	311	937
All	5223	2155	7378 (*)

(\*): Refer also to paragraph 5.5 below.

- 5.2 It is acknowledged that the needs identified in the HNMS relate to a three-year period, as opposed to the twenty-year period of spatial planning covered by the LDF. However, paragraph 29 of PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to set overall (i.e. plan-wide) targets, based on available assessments: the HNMS provides the most up-to-date available assessment.
- 5.3 The Core Strategy proposes that a minimum of 60% private sector housing will be needed on each site, in order to deliver the level of affordable housing need identified in the HNMS. It is anticipated that a higher percentage of affordable housing might be achieved on specific sites, but it is not possible to quantify this on a Community Area or district-wide basis at this stage.
- 5.4 Therefore, the illustrative housing distribution figures are calculated on the basis that the level of private sector housing required in order to deliver the affordable need identified in the HNMS, would be 1.5 times the level of affordable housing in each Community Area. With the exception of the Mere Community Area, the levels of private sector need identified in the HNMS would be sufficient to meet this requirement.
- 5.5 In order to meet the identified affordable need in the Mere area the number of private sector housing would need to be raised to 150, resulting in an overall total requirement of 250 in that Area and 7417 across all the Community Areas.
- 5.6 There has been a strong indication from all Community Areas that levels of new housing should be based on identified needs. We have listened to this message and reviewed our methods of distributing housing growth.
- 5.7 The HNMS provides the most up to date evidence available to us in respect of housing needs, but it should be noted that the needs identified are in fact

higher in the Downton and Tisbury Community Areas than total numbers of dwellings suggested during previous stages of the Core Strategy process.

### **The Regional Spatial Strategy**

- 5.8 Policy HMA11 and Key Diagram Inset 11 of the revised RSS indicate the need to accommodate 12400 dwellings in the Salisbury Housing Market Area (“HMA”), and a preferred split between urban (6000) and rural (6400) numbers of housing is expressed. The extent of the HMA coincides with the administrative boundary of the former Salisbury District Council. Therefore, the implication of the RSS requirement is a need for the LDF to find sites for 6400 houses in that area, outside of Salisbury city.
- 5.9 It is acknowledged that the economy is currently in depression, but it is likely that there will be further demand for housing during the lifetime of the LDF. It would be irresponsible of the Council not to plan ahead for this and the revised RSS figures are based on predictions of population growth – and the therefore likely increase in demand in the area should the economy recover.
- 5.10 Paragraph 5.1 identifies a need for 3968 dwellings in the Salisbury SCCT area, and there is therefore a need to locate a further 2032 dwellings in this area, in order to achieve the RSS preferred urban total of 6000. Therefore, given the HNMS figures identified in paragraph 5.1, there is a requirement to fairly distribute a further 2951 dwellings across the district in order to meet the full requirements of the RSS. This figure is arrived by subtracting the following from the overall 12400 RSS requirement:

Total Identified Needs (see paragraphs 5.1 and 5.5):	7417
Balance of Urban RSS Requirement (see above):	2032
Total:	9449

### **Preferred Options**

- 5.11 In the spring of 2008 the Council consulted on three options that would meet the combined HNMS needs and RSS requirements for housing. In simplistic terms these were:
- The creation of a new settlement of 2500 dwellings near the A30, north east of Salisbury, with the balance of rural housing dispersed across the remainder of the district, or
  - The creation of an urban extension of 2500 dwellings around the existing settlement of Firsdawn, with the balance of rural housing dispersed across the remainder of the district, or
  - The dispersal of all rural housing across the whole district.
- 5.12 Analysis of consultation responses, including from Statutory Consultees, identified strong objections to the first two scenarios, and the Council did therefore take them forward as Preferred Options.

5.13 Further consultation was carried out in the early autumn of 2008, which set out broad numbers of housing that might be accommodated in rural areas. The results of this consultation are outlined in paragraphs 1.20 to 1.23. As stated in paragraph 1.25, some concerns were expressed as to how these numbers had been arrived at and we are therefore now reviewing our approach to this.

## **6.0 INDICATIVE LEVELS OF HOUSING BY COMMUNITY AREA**

- 6.1 The short-term housing needs for individual Community Areas, as identified in the HNMS, are set out in paragraph 5.1. In addition to this, there is a need to divide the balance of 2951 houses required by the RSS (as identified in paragraph 5.10) between the Community Areas on the basis of their existing Basic Facilities.
- 6.2 It is important to note that, although these figures have been expressed precisely for the purposes of these calculations, they remain indicative. Figures will be likely to be rounded in the Core Strategy document, and will include contingency measures and extant allocations and commitments. Actual numbers of new dwellings within Community Areas will be dependent on availability of appropriate sites and subject of a SSA DPD and further consultation in due course.

### **The New Forest National Park**

- 6.3 As the Salisbury HMA coincides with the administrative boundary of the Council, a part of it lies within the jurisdiction of the New Forest NPA for planning purposes. This area has a reasonable number of Basic Facilities, and using our methodology would have been identified as being able to accommodate a modest degree of housing. However, as this area is not within the Council's spatial planning jurisdiction, we have not included these Basic Facilities in the calculations for the Downton Community Area.
- 6.4 The NPA has recently issued a Consultation Draft Core Strategy, in which those Wiltshire villages within its jurisdiction are effectively classified as Open Countryside, where new housing would only be permitted on the basis of a site-specific agricultural or forestry need.
- 6.5 Whilst we fully understand the priorities of the NPA we feel that its Core Strategy should seek to balance these priorities with the ongoing needs of the New Forest communities. We have therefore responded to the NPA Consultation Draft expressing concern that the Core Strategy does not properly address housing needs in the forest as a whole, and in that part of it which lies within the Salisbury HMA in particular.
- 6.6 Notwithstanding this, as matters stand our own calculations have been based on there being no housing allocations in this area. However, these calculations might be subject to further review at the SSA DPD stage, dependent on how the NPA Core Strategy evolves.

### **Salisbury SSCT**

- 6.7 We have considered the figures required by the RSS and find that attempting to physically accommodate all of the preferred number of urban dwellings within the city boundaries is not possible without intensifying development to such an extent that the character and appearance of large areas of the city

would be irrevocably damaged through increased building heights, as there are very few brownfield sites available.

- 6.8 The only alternative is to extend the built element of the city into adjoining parishes. As a result some of our identified strategic sites are technically within rural Community Areas but our view is that to all intents and purposes these sites constitute an extension to the city.
- 6.9 However, the lack of available brownfield sites applies equally to other settlements, and we believe that the SSCT is so functionally dominant, and so well served by Basic Facilities in relation to the remainder of the district, that it should accommodate a proportionate share of the 6400 houses expressed in the RSS as being preferred for the rural areas.
- 6.10 This is further supported by the city's role and function in the wider region, serving a hinterland stretching beyond south Wiltshire into Hampshire and Dorset. Comparison shows that, with the exception of Barnstaple, Salisbury is the most isolated SSCT from other settlements in this category within the South West. Salisbury therefore represents a centre for a relatively larger area compared to other SSCTs.
- 6.11 The number of Basic Facilities in the SSCT is 45: the equivalent of the combined number of such facilities in Amesbury and The Garrison Villages and the Local Service Centres identified in section 3. This being the case, it should accommodate 1476 dwellings: 50% of the outstanding HNMS figure of 2951. The total level of housing to be accommodated in and directly around the SSCT would therefore be:

Identified HNMS Need (see paragraph 5.1):	3968
Balance of RSS Urban Figure: (see paragraph 5.10):	2032
Proportion of RSS Rural Figure: (see above):	1476
Total:	7476

### **Wilton Community Area**

- 6.12 LDF proposals for the Wilton Community Area have previously been expressed in composite with those of the SSCT and we will therefore examine suggested levels of housing in this area next.
- 6.13 Amesbury and The Garrison Villages, and the area they serve are identified in section 3 as having significantly different characteristics to the other rural centres and Community Areas, and consequently have been designated with a unique category in the settlement strategy hierarchy of settlements. The suggested level of housing numbers in the Amesbury Community Area is therefore dealt with below.
- 6.14 The division of Basic Facilities across the remaining four Community Areas is as follows:

Downton Community Area:	44 (38 %)
Mere Community Area:	11 (10 %)
Tisbury Community Area:	26 (22 %)
Wilton Community Area	35 (30 %)
 Total:	 116 (100 %)

6.15 Therefore, the Wilton Community Area should accommodate 443 (i.e. 30%) of the remaining 1475 dwellings that need to be dispersed across the rural areas (i.e. 2951 – 1476 (see paragraph 6.11)). This number, together with the needs identified for the area in the HNMS (see paragraph 5.1) results in a total figure of 1380.

6.16 The total indicative number of houses in the SSCT and Four Rivers Community Area is therefore 8856 (7476 + 1380). This results in a need to provide a total of 3544 dwellings across the remainder of the district (i.e. 12400 (from The RSS) - 8856).

### **Amesbury Community Area**

6.17 The HNMS figures in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.5 show that there is a need to provide 2512 further houses across the remaining Community Areas. This results in a requirement to fairly distribute a further 1032 dwellings across these areas in order to meet the additional requirements of the RSS (i.e. 3544 (from paragraph 6.16) – 2512).

6.18 As can be seen from paragraph 3.17, the role and function of Amesbury, supported by The Garrison Villages of Bulford and Durrington, is markedly different from Local Service Centres in other Community Areas. Amesbury and The Garrison Villages fare very well in terms of Basic Facilities, with a total of 24 concentrated within a relatively small geographical area. In comparison the Local Service Centres at Downton, Mere and Tisbury have a combined total of 17 Basic Facilities spread across the south and west of the Core Strategy area.

6.19 The total number of Basic Facilities in the Amesbury Community Area is 54, compared with a combined total of 81 across the other three rural Community Areas. The area therefore has a level of Basic Facilities equivalent to approximately 67% of the combined facilities of the other areas.

6.20 Taken individually, Amesbury and The Garrison Villages each have a larger population than that of any other Local Service Centres. Their combined population is equivalent to approximately 47% of that of the SSCT, and is more than 2.5 times the combined population of the Local Service Centres at Downton, Tisbury and Mere. The total population of the Amesbury Community Area has a level in excess of that of the combined populations of the Downton, Tisbury and Mere Community Areas.

6.21 As stated in paragraph 3.3, existing population is not considered to be a crucial factor in assessing the sustainable location of new development. However,

these figures are quoted here in order to further demonstrate that there are significant differences in character between Amesbury and The Garrison Villages, and the other Local Service Centres across south Wiltshire, and between the Amesbury Community Area and the other rural Community Areas.

- 6.22 Taking this into account, our view is that the dispersal of housing in the Amesbury Community Area should be considered separately from that in other rural areas and, in fact, should be assessed using a comparison to the urban RSS housing requirements for the Salisbury HMA.
- 6.23 The combined number of Basic Facilities within Amesbury and The Garrison Villages equates to 49% of those within the SSCT and Wilton. However, transport links are limited in relation to the SSCT and there are additional constraints, particularly in terms of impact on the Stonehenge World Heritage Site and Salisbury Plain Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Area, and uncertainty over the availability of MoD land.
- 6.24 Taking all of these factors into consideration, our view is that the Amesbury Community Area could accommodate a number equivalent to around 35% of the dwellings proposed in the RSS for the Salisbury SSCT: a figure of 2100. The HNMS identified a need in the Area for 1180 new dwellings, and this would therefore result in the Community Area accommodating 920 of the 1032 'RSS Rural Balance' figure identified in paragraph 6.17.
- 6.25 Although this represents a significant part of the overall figure, our view is that this is an appropriate and sustainable approach given the unique function and role of Amesbury and The Garrison Villages, the number and range of Basic Facilities across the Community Area as a whole, the identification of potential strategic sites at Archers Gate and Solstice Park and the relatively better access and less constrained landscape in comparison with the remaining rural Community Areas.

### **Downton, Mere and Tisbury Community Areas**

- 6.26 Taking our review of the housing numbers for the Amesbury Community Area into account, there is a need to accommodate 112 of the balance of the rural RSS figures across the remaining three Community Areas (i.e. 1032 - 920). We have again looked at the availability of Basic Facilities in order to determine how this number can be dispersed in a sustainable manner.

- 6.27 The division of Basic Facilities across the remaining three areas is as follows

Downton Community Area:	44 (54 %)
Mere Community Area:	11 (14 %)
Tisbury Community Area:	26 (32 %)
Total:	81 (100 %)

- 6.28 The numbers of housing proposed in each Community Area is therefore:

### **Downton Community Area**

HNMS Figure: 678  
+ 54 % of 112 'RSS Balance': 60

Total: 738

### **Mere Community Area**

HNMS Figure: 250  
+ 14 % of 112 'RSS Balance': 16

Total: 266

### **Tisbury Community Area**

HNMS Figure: 404  
+ 32 % of 112 'RSS Balance': 36

Total: 440

### **Overall Distribution**

6.29 The overall distribution of the 12400 dwellings required by the RSS for the Salisbury HMA would therefore be:

Salisbury SSCT/Wilton Community Area	8856 (paragraph 6.16)
Amesbury Community Area	2100 (paragraph 6.24)
Downton Community Area	738 (paragraph 6.28)
Mere Community Area	266 (paragraph 6.28)
Tisbury Community Area	440 (paragraph 6.28)
Total	12400

## **7.0 INDICATIVE LEVELS OF HOUSING BY LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE**

- 7.1 The aim will be to fairly disperse the housing figures identified for the Community Areas around the settlements within each area, dependent on the availability of sites. At this stage, we have only identified numbers of dwellings for Local Service Centres, as they are likely to accommodate the largest individual numbers in each area.
- 7.2 In calculating these figures, we have only considered the numbers of Basic Facilities in settlements categorised in Section 3 as ‘Secondary Villages’ or higher, as settlements below that category have been identified as having little scope for new development beyond limited infill and exception sites.
- 7.3 It is again important to note that, although these figures have been expressed precisely for the purposes of these calculations, they remain indicative. The figures will be likely to be rounded in the Core Strategy document, and will include contingency measures and extant allocations and commitments. Actual numbers of dwellings within settlements will be dependent on availability of appropriate sites and subject of a SSA DPD and further consultation in due course.

### **Amesbury Community Area**

- 7.4 Amesbury, The Garrison Villages and the Secondary Villages (Porton, Shrewton, Tilshead and The Winterbournes) in this area have a combined total of 36 Basic Facilities, of which Amesbury and The Garrison Villages have a combined total of 24 (67 %). The number of new houses in Amesbury and The Garrison Villages would therefore be likely to be around 1407 (67 % of 2100).

### **Downton Community Area**

- 7.5 The Local Service Centre (Downton) and Secondary Villages (Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Morgans Vale/Woodfalls, Pitton, Whiteparish and The Winterslows) in this area have a combined total of 27 Basic Facilities, of which Downton has 7 (26 %). The number of new houses in Downton would therefore be likely to be around 192 (26 % of 738).

### **Mere Community Area**

- 7.6 Mere is the only settlement in this area with sufficient Basic Facilities to accommodate any significant numbers of dwellings and, unless appropriate infill or exception sites can be identified elsewhere in the Community Area, would have to accommodate all of the 266 dwellings proposed for this area.

### **Tisbury Community Area**

- 7.7 The Local Service Centre (Tisbury) and Secondary Villages (Fovant, Hindon and Ludwell) in this area have a combined total of 14 Basic Facilities, of

which Tisbury has 5 (36 %). The number of new houses in Tisbury would therefore be likely to be around 158 (36 % of 440).

## 8.0 COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED LEVELS OF HOUSING

### The Topic Paper and Addendum

- 8.1 Whilst The Topic Paper did not set out suggested numbers of levels of housing, The Addendum suggested the following totals should be considered in the rural Community Area centres:

Amesbury (with Durrington and Bulford): 1500-2500.

Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton: 1000-1500 (NB: As a group - not individually).

### Preferred Options

- 8.2 The spring 2008 Preferred Options consultation suggested the following approximate levels of housing that might be accommodated in each area. In each case a range of figures was suggested, dependent on which of the options referred to in paragraph 5.11 was pursued. As the first two options are no longer to be pursued, the figures below only relate to the third option, in the interests of avoiding confusion:

Salisbury SSCT/Wilton	7300
Mere	500
Nadder (i.e. Tisbury)	350
Southern (i.e. Downton)	1500
Stonehenge (i.e. Amesbury)	3000

### Evolved Preferred Options

- 8.3 Following analysis of consultation responses on our Preferred Options, the subsequent 'Our Place In The Future' Preferred Options consultation suggested revised approximate levels of housing that might be accommodated in each Community Area as follows:

Salisbury SSCT/Wilton	8700
Mere	510
Nadder (i.e. Tisbury)	360
Southern (i.e. Downton)	590
Stonehenge (i.e. Amesbury)	2240

- 8.4 The reviewed distribution figures show reductions in the Amesbury area to 2100 (105 dwellings per annum "dpa") and the Mere area to 266 (13-14 dpa), but increases in the Salisbury/Wilton area to 8856 (442-443 dpa), the Downton area to 738 (c37 dpa) and, to a lesser extent, in the Tisbury area to 440 (22 dpa).
- 8.5 The 'Our Place In The Future' Preferred Options consultation suggested approximate levels of housing that might be accommodated in each Local Service Centre as follows:

Amesbury	1025
Mere	<300
Nadder (i.e. Tisbury)	250
Southern (i.e. Downton)	200

- 8.6 The reviewed distribution figures show an increase to 1407 (70-71 dpa) in Amesbury and The Garrison Villages, although it should be noted that the lower figure only referred to a single strategic site (Archers Gate). The figure for Downton is slightly lower at 192 (9-10 dpa) and there are larger reductions in the figures for Mere to 266 (13-14 dpa) and Tisbury to 158 (c8 dpa).
- 8.7 As previously stated, there has been a strong message from all Community Areas that levels of new housing in the rural areas should be based on identified local needs. It is for this reason that - using the evidence of the HNMS as a starting point - there has been an increase over previously suggested numbers in some areas and reductions elsewhere.
- 8.8 Notwithstanding this, the average difference in distribution of proposed housing in each Community Area (including that for Salisbury and Wilton, which is unchanged by this review) is about 154 (c8 dpa). We believe that this level of change does not have a material impact on the Core Strategy, particularly when (as stated in paragraphs 6.2 and 7.3), actual numbers of dwellings within individual rural Community Areas and settlements will be dependent on availability of appropriate sites and subject of a SSA DPD and further consultation in due course.

## **APPENDIX ONE: BASIC FACILITIES MATRIX**

### **BASIC FACILITIES IN THE SALISBURY SSCT AREA**

<b>SETTLEMENT</b>	<b>SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GENERAL SHOP</b>	<b>POST OFFICE</b>	<b>JTW TRANSPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Salisbury SSCT	21	19	3	2	45

### **BASIC FACILITIES IN AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA**

<b>SETTLEMENT</b>	<b>SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GENERAL SHOP</b>	<b>POST OFFICE</b>	<b>JTW TRANSPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Allington	-	-	-	-	-
Amesbury	4	4	1	1	10
Boscombe	-	-	-	-	-
Bulford	2	1	-	1	4
Cholderton	-	-	-	1	1
Durrington	4	4	1	1	10
Figheldean/Ablington	1	1	-	-	2
Firsdawn	-	-	-	1	1
Gomeldon	1	-	-	1	2
Great Durnford	-	-	-	1	1
Idmiston	-	-	-	-	-
Lake	-	-	-	1	1
Lower Woodford	-	-	-	1	1
Middle Woodford	1	-	-	1	2
Milston	-	-	-	1	1

Netton	-	-	-	-	-
Newton Tony	1	-	1	-	2
Orcheston	-	1	-	1	2
Porton	1	1	-	1	3
Shrewton	1	1	-	1	3
Tilshead	1	1	-	1	3
Upper Woodford	-	-	-	1	1
West Amesbury	-	-	-	-	-
Wilsford	-	-	-	1	1
The Winterbournes	1	1	-	1	3
Total	18	15	3	18	54

**BASIC FACILITIES IN DOWNTON COMMUNITY AREA (EXCLUDING NEW FOREST NATIONAL PARK)**

<b>SETTLEMENT</b>	<b>SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GENERAL SHOP</b>	<b>POST OFFICE</b>	<b>JTW TRANSPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Alderbury	1	2	-	1	4
Bodenham	-	1	-	1	2
Britford	1	-	-	1	2
Charlton All Saints	-	-	-	1	1
Coombe Bissett	1	1	-	1	3
Downton	2	2	2	1	7
East Grimstead	-	-	-	1	1
Farley	-	-	-	1	1
Ford	-	-	-	1	1
Homington	-	-	-	1	1
Lopcombe Corner	-	-	-	1	1

Morgans Vale/Woodfalls	1	1	-	1	3
Newton	-	-	-	1	1
Nunton	-	-	-	1	1
Odstock	1	-	-	1	2
Petersfinger	-	-	-	1	1
Pitton	1	1	-	1	3
West Dean	-	-	-	1	1
West Grimstead	-	-	-	1	1
Whiteparish	1	1	-	1	3
The Winterslows	1	1	1	1	4
Total	10	10	3	21	44

#### **BASIC FACILITIES IN MERE COMMUNITY AREA**

<b>SETTLEMENT</b>	<b>SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GENERAL SHOP</b>	<b>POST OFFICE</b>	<b>JTW TRANSPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Barkers Hill	-	-	-	-	-
East Knoyle	-	1	-	-	1
Hugglers Hole	-	-	-	-	-
Kilmington	1	-	-	-	1
Maiden Bradley	-	1	-	-	1
Mere	1	2	1	1	5
Sedgehill	-	-	-	-	-
Semley	1	-	-	-	1
Stourton	-	-	-	-	-
West Knoyle	-	-	-	-	-

White Cross	-	-	-	-	-
Zeals	1	-	-	1	2
Total	4	4	1	2	11

### BASIC FACILITIES IN TISBURY COMMUNITY AREA

SETTLEMENT	SCHOOLS	GENERAL SHOP	POST OFFICE	JTW TRANSPORT	TOTAL
Ansty	-	-	-	1	1
Berwick St John	-	-	-	1	1
Berwick St Leonard	-	-	-	1	1
Charlton	-	-	-	1	1
Chicklade	-	-	-	-	-
Chicksgrove	-	-	-	-	-
Chilmark	1	-	-	1	2
Donhead St Andrew	-	-	-	1	1
Donhead St Mary	-	-	-	1	1
Fonthill Bishop	-	-	-	1	1
Fonthill Gifford	-	-	-	1	1
Fovant	-	1	1	1	3
Hindon	1	1	-	1	3
Ludwell	1	1	-	1	3
Newtown/Pythouse	-	-	-	-	-
Sutton Mandeville	-	-	-	1	1
Sutton Row	-	-	-	-	-
Swallowcliffe	-	-	-	1	1
Tisbury	2	1	1	1	5

Tollard Royal	-	-	-	-	-
Total	5	4	2	15	26

### **BASIC FACILITIES IN WILTON COMMUNITY AREA**

<b>SETTLEMENT</b>	<b>SCHOOLS</b>	<b>GENERAL SHOP</b>	<b>POST OFFICE</b>	<b>JTW TRANSPORT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Alvediston	-	-	-	1	1
Barford St Martin	1	-	-	1	2
Berwick St James	-	-	-	1	1
Bishopstone	-	-	-	1	1
Bowerchalke	-	-	-	-	-
Broad Chalke	1	1	-	1	3
Burcombe	-	-	-	1	1
Compton Chamberlayne	-	-	-	1	1
Deptford	-	-	-	1	1
Dinton	1	1	-	1	3
Ebbesbourne Wake	-	-	-	-	-
Fisherton De La Mere	-	-	-	1	1
Great Wishford	1	1	-	1	3
Hanging Langford	-	-	-	1	1
Netherhampton	-	-	-	-	-
Quidhampton	-	-	-	1	1
South Newton	-	-	-	1	1
Stapleford	-	-	1	1	2
Steeple Langford	1	-	-	1	2

Stoford	-	-	-	1	1
Stratford Tony	-	-	-	1	1
Teffont Magna and Evias	-	-	-	1	1
Wilton	1	2	-	1	4
Winterbourne Stoke	-	-	-	1	1
Wylve	-	1	-	1	2
Total	6	6	1	22	35

## **APPENDIX TWO: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN SSCT**

### **SALISBURY SSCT**

14 Primary Schools: Bemerton St Johns; Greentrees; Harnham Juniors; Harnham Infants; Pembroke Park; Salisbury Manor Fields; Sarum St Pauls; St Andrews; St Marks; St Martins; St Osmonds; Stratford Sub Castle; Woodlands; Wyndham Park.

6 Secondary Schools: Bishop Wordsworths Grammar; Salisbury High; St Edmunds; St Josephs; South Wilts Grammar; Wyvern College.

1 Combined Primary and Secondary School: Exeter House.

5 Supermarkets: Iceland; Sainsburys; Tesco (Castle Street); Tesco (Southampton Road); Waitrose.

14 Convenience Stores: One Stop (Barrington Road); Co Op (Castle Road); One Stop (Church Road, Laverstock); Asian Store (Fisherton Street); Patels (Fisherton Street); Spar (Gainsborough Close); Co Op (Kelsey Road); One Stop (Netherhampton Road); Pinewood Stores (Pinewood Way); Abbey Stores (Salt Lane); Spar (Sycamore Drive); Tollgate Stores (Tollgate Road); Co Op (Wilton Road); West End Stores (Wilton Road).

3 Separate Post Offices: Castle Street; High Street; Pembroke Road.

2 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport (Bus and Train)

**APPENDIX THREE: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN THE AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA**

**AMESBURY AND THE GARRISON VILLAGES**

**AMESBURY**

- 3 Primary Schools (Archers, C of E; Christ The King RC)
- 1 Secondary School (Stonehenge)
- 4 General Food Shops (Co Op; Lidl's; Somerfield; One Stop)
- 1 Separate (from Food Shops) Post Office (Salisbury Street)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BULFORD**

- 2 Primary Schools (C of E Infants; Kiwi)
- 1 General Food Shop (Salisbury Road)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**DURRINGTON**

- 3 Primary Schools (C of E Infants; C of E Juniors; Larkhill)
- 1 Secondary School (Avon Valley)
- 4 General Food Shops (Sainsburys; Tesco; Co Op; Larkhill)
- 1 Separate Post Office (Larkhill)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**REMAINDER OF AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA**

**CHOLDERTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FIGHELDEAN AND ABLINGTON**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop

**FIRSDOWN**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**GOMELDON**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**GREAT DURNFORD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**LAKE**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

LOWER WOODFORD

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

MIDDLE WOODFORD

1 Primary School

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

MILSTON

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

NEWTON TONY

1 Primary School

1 Separate Post Office

ORCHESTON

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

PORTON

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

SHREWTON

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

TILSHEAD

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

UPPER WOODFORD

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

WILSFORD

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

THE WINTERBOURNES

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**APPENDIX FOUR: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN  
DOWNTON COMMUNITY AREA**

**LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE: DOWNTON**

- 1 Primary School (Gravel Close)
- 1 Secondary School (Trafalgar)
- 2 General Food Shops (Co Op; High Street)
- 2 Separate Post Offices (High Street; Headlands)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**REMAINDER OF DOWNTON COMMUNITY AREA**

**ALDERBURY**

- 1 Primary School
- 2 General Food Shops
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BODENHAM**

- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BRITFORD**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**CHARLTON-ALL-SAINTS**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**COOMBE BISSETT**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**EAST GRIMSTEAD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FARLEY**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FORD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**HOMINGTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**LOPCOMBE CORNER**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**MORGANS VALE/WOODFALLS**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**NEWTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**NUNTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**ODSTOCK**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**PETERSFINGER**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**PITTON**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**WEST DEAN**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport (Train)

**WEST GRIMSTEAD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**WHITEPARISH**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**THE WINTERSLOWS**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Separate Post Office
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**APPENDIX FIVE: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN MERE COMMUNITY AREA**

**LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE: MERE**

- 1 Primary School (White Road)
- 2 General Food Shops (Co Op; Spar)
- 1 Separate Post Office (Boar Street)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**REMAINDER OF MERE COMMUNITY AREA**

**EAST KNOYLE**

- 1 General Food Shop

**KILMINGTON**

- 1 Primary School

**MAIDEN BRADLEY**

- 1 General Food Shop

**SEMLEY**

- 1 Primary School

**ZEALS**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**APPENDIX SIX: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN THE  
TISBURY COMMUNITY AREA**

**LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE: TISBURY**

- 2 Primary Schools (C of E; Roman Catholic)
- 1 General Food Shop (Co Op)
- 1 Separate Post Office (High Street)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport (Train)

**REMAINDER OF TISBURY COMMUNITY AREA**

**ANSTY**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BERWICK ST JOHN**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BERWICK ST LEONARD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**CHARLTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**CHILMARK**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**DONHEAD ST ANDREW**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**DONHEAD ST MARY**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FONTHILL BISHOP**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FONTHILL GIFFORD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FOVANT**

- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Separate Post Office
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**HINDON**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

LUDWELL

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

SUTTON MANDEVILLE

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

SWALLOWCLIFFE

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**APPENDIX SEVEN: LIST OF BASIC FACILITIES CONSIDERED IN WILTON COMMUNITY AREA**

**LOCAL SERVICE CENTRE: WILTON**

- 1 Primary School
- 2 General Food Shops (From Town Council RFS Survey Return)
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**REMAINDER OF WILTON COMMUNITY AREA**

**ALVEDISTON**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BARFORD ST MARTIN**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BERWICK ST JAMES**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BISHOPSTONE**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BROAD CHALKE**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**BURCOMBE**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**COMPTON CHAMBERLAYNE**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**DEPTFORD**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**DINTON**

- 1 Primary School
- 1 General Food Shop
- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**FISHERTON DE LA MERE**

- 1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

GREAT WISHFORD

1 Primary School

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

HANGING LANGFORD

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

QUIDHAMPTON

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

SOUTH NEWTON

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

STAPLEFORD

1 Post Office

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

STEEPLE LANGFORD

1 Primary School

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

STOFORD

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

STRATFORD TONY

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

TEFFONT MAGNA AND EVIAS

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

WINTERBOURNE STOKE

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

WYLYE

1 General Food Shop

1 Means of Journey To Work Public Transport

**APPENDIX EIGHT: SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF HOUSING DISTRIBUTION CALCULATIONS**

**TOTAL IDENTIFIED LOCAL NEEDS (paragraphs 5.1 to 5.5)**

1A	3968 (Salisbury)
1B	1180 (Amesbury)
1C	678 (Downton)
1D	250 (Mere)
1E	404 (Tisbury)
1F	937 (Wilton)
1G	7417 (Total)

**REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY REQUIREMENTS (paragraph 5.8)**

2A	6000 (Preferred Urban Requirement)
2B	6400 (Preferred Rural Requirement)
2C	12400 (Total)

**BALANCE OF RSS PREFERRED URBAN REQUIREMENT (paragraph 5.10)**

3	2032 (6000 (from 2A) – 3968 (from 1A))
---	--

**BALANCE OF OVERALL RSS REQUIREMENT (paragraph 5.10)**

4	2951 (12400 (from 2C) – 7417 (from 1G) – 2032 (from 3))
---	---

**HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN AND AROUND THE SSCT (paragraph 6.11)**

5	7476 (3968 (from 1A) + 2032 (from 3) + 1476 (percentage split of 4 based on Basic Facilities))
---	--

**HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE WILTON COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.15)**

6	1380 (937 (from 1F) + 443 (percentage split of 4 based on Basic Facilities))
---	--

**COMBINED HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN AND AROUND THE SSCT AND IN THE WILTON COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.16)**

7	8856 (7476 (from 5) + 1380 (from 6))
---	--------------------------------------

**TOTAL BALANCE OF HOUSING TO BE ACCOMMODATED ACROSS THE REMAINING FOUR COMMUNITY AREAS (paragraph 6.16)**

8	3544 (12400 (from 2C) – 8856 (from 7))
---	--

**TOTAL IDENTIFIED LOCAL NEEDS ACROSS THE REMAINING FOUR COMMUNITY AREAS (paragraph 6.17)**

9	2512 (1180 (from 1B) + 678 (from 1C) + 250 (from 1D) + 404 (from 1E))
---	---

**BALANCE OF RSS HOUSING TO BE ACCOMMODATED ACROSS THE REMAINING FOUR COMMUNITY AREAS (paragraph 6.17)**

10	1032 (3544 (from 8) – 2512 (from 9))
----	--------------------------------------

**TOTAL HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.24)**

11	2100 (percentage split relative to 6000 (from 2A) based on Basic Facilities)
----	--

**RSS HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE AMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.24)**

12	920 (2100 (from 11) – 1180 (from 1C))
----	---------------------------------------

**BALANCE OF RSS HOUSING TO BE ACCOMMODATED ACROSS THE REMAINING THREE COMMUNITY AREAS (paragraph 6.26)**

13	112 (1032 (from 10) – 920 (from 12))
----	--------------------------------------

**HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE DOWNTON COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.28)**

14	738 (678 (from 1C) + percentage split of 112 (from 13) based on Basic Facilities)
----	---

**HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE MERE COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.28)**

15	266 (2504 (from 1D) + percentage split of 112 (from 13) based on Basic Facilities)
----	--

**HOUSING NUMBERS TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE TISBURY COMMUNITY AREA (paragraph 6.28)**

16	440 (404 (from 1E) + percentage split of 112 (from 13) based on Basic Facilities)
----	---

## **APPENDIX NINE: DRAFT CORE STRATEGY POLICY**

Taking into account the rigorous processes, consultation and analysis undertaken by the Council and outlined above, it was considered appropriate to include the following policy within the Core Strategy:

### **Policy A: Sustainable Settlement Strategy**

The following settlement strategy will form the framework for delivering growth and meeting local needs in a managed way, complementing the existing pattern of development whilst not eroding local character. It is based on focusing new growth on settlements that already have a range of services and facilities, in order to reinforce their important role in providing an accessible and sustainable pattern of development

This settlement strategy is based on the following hierarchy:

A: Salisbury: The primary service centre in south Wiltshire. Because of the level of services, shops, jobs and homes the city provides, the larger proportion of growth will be concentrated here.

B: The Northern Group: Amesbury, supported by Durrington and Bulford: A unique group of settlements with a good level of services supported by employment. A significant, proportionate degree of growth will be allocated here.

C: Local Service Centres: Downton, Mere, Tisbury and Wilton: Important local centres that provide a good level of services to their surrounding areas. An appropriate level of growth will help them retain viability in their own right and maintain their wider role.

D: Secondary Villages: Alderbury, Broadchalke, Coombe Bissett, Dinton, Fovant, Great Wishford, Hindon, Ludwell, Morgan's Vale/Woodfalls, Pitton, Porton, Shrewton, Tilshead, Whiteparish, The Winterbournes and The Winterslows: Villages that provide a reasonable level of local services and facilities and where modest growth will be supported.

E: Small Villages: Barford St Martin, Bodenham, Britford, Chilmark, Figcheldean/Ablington, Gomeldon, Middle Woodford, Newton Toney, Odstock, Orcheston, Stapleford, Steeple Langford, Wylve and Zeals: Villages with limited services where only infill and exception development will be permitted.

F: Smallest Settlements and The Countryside: All other settlements and the open countryside where development policies will be restrictive.

The hierarchical grouping of settlements is no intended to indicate that each settlement within a tier will accommodate the same numerical level of growth. Further consideration will be given to local factors including landscape constraints, character, sensitivity and

need when assessing the extent and suitability of development sites beyond those already allocated within the Core Strategy.

## TARGETS

Qualitative: The delivery of levels of growth in conformity with the Settlement Strategy.

## MONITORING AND REVIEW

AMR & housing trajectory, number of dwellings built in sustainable locations aligned with the Sustainable Settlement Strategy

## DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council, Development Industry, Strategic Partnerships.

## **APPENDIX TEN**

### **CHANGES TO DRAFT POLICY AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING REFINEMENT**

The initial policy text was subjected to Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment as well as editing refinement and advice from parties such as GOSW. As a result of this the following amendments were made to the text to ensure conformity with both European Directives as well as ensuing central and regional policy are not repeated and future editing ensured.

Various iterations resulted in the Policy being redrafted as below (housing numbers are rounded and incorporate extant allocations and commitments: see also Housing and Economy Topic Papers and Addenda):

#### **The Settlement Strategy and Distribution Of Growth**

This strategy plans for the delivery of 12400 dwellings and 13900 jobs over the period to 2026. The growth required to meet local needs will be accommodated in the following manner:

##### **Salisbury**

###### **Planned growth:**

7480 homes and 36 ha (30ha new allocation and 6ha saved) of employment land.

A retail-led mixed-use development is also planned in Salisbury.

The city of Salisbury is identified as a Strategically Significant City or Town (“SSCT”) under Development Policy A of the RSS. Salisbury is the primary service, economic and cultural centre for south Wiltshire and, in line with RSS, will remain the focal point for the majority of new development in south Wiltshire.

##### **Amesbury Community Area**

###### **Planned growth:**

Amesbury: 1960 homes

Rest of Amesbury Community Area: 690 homes, 17 ha of employment land

Amesbury, with support from Durrington and Bulford, is the Service Centre for the area. Although these settlements are distinct from one another, their close geographical and functional relationships mean that they constitute a unique group of settlements within south Wiltshire that neither conforms to the SSCT category nor is directly comparable with the Local Service Centres or any of the Village categories. The Amesbury Community Area contains the majority of allocated employment land in south Wiltshire, including land at Solstice Park, Boscombe Down and Porton Down.

The Community Area has three secondary villages (equivalent to RSS Development Policy C): Porton, Shrewton and Tilshead, where limited growth will be appropriate.

##### **Downton Community Area**

###### **Planned Growth:**

Downton: 190 homes

Rest of Downton Community Area: 550 homes

Downton is a large settlement providing a good level of services and performs the role of Local Service Centre for this Community Area. It provides a good source of employment and has one of eight strategically important employment sites in south Wiltshire.

The Community Area has six secondary villages (equivalent to RSS Development Policy C): Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Morgan's Vale/Woodfalls, Pitton, Whiteparish and The Winterslows, where limited growth will be appropriate.

### **Mere Community Area**

#### **Planned Growth:**

Mere: 270 homes, 3 ha of employment land

Rest of Mere Community Area: 20 homes

Mere is the Local Service Centre for this Community Area as it offers a range of services and facilities and is an important centre for the outlying villages in the western part of south Wiltshire. This Community Area is unique in south Wiltshire in that there are no settlements that perform a Secondary Village role. Hence it is anticipated that the majority of growth will take place in Mere over the plan period. The existing Local Plan employment allocation at Mere of approximately 3 hectares will be implemented during the period of this Strategy.

### **Tisbury Community Area**

#### **Planned Growth:**

Tisbury: 160 homes, 1.4 ha of employment land

Rest of Tisbury Community Area: 280

Tisbury is the Local Service Centre for this Community Area and serves a wide and sparsely populated hinterland. The existing Local Plan employment and housing allocations on Hindon Lane will be implemented during the period of this Strategy. The Community Area has three secondary villages (equivalent to RSS Development Policy C): Fovant, Hindon and Ludwell, where limited growth will be appropriate.

### **Wilton Community Area**

#### **Planned growth:**

Wilton: 620 homes, 3 ha of employment land

Rest of Wilton Community Area: 950 homes

Wilton is the Local Service Centre for this Community Area and relates to Development Policy B in the RSS. The proximity of Salisbury to the east means that Wilton has a functional relationship with its larger neighbour but retains an identity of its own. The UK Land Forces HQ in Wilton is a strategically important regeneration site, which will deliver employment and housing.

The Community Area has three secondary villages (equivalent to RSS Development Policy C): Broadchalke, Dinton and Great Wishford, where limited growth will be appropriate.

The Council's target for housing development on previously developed land is 34% from the date of adoption of this Core Strategy to 2026. This includes the conversion of existing buildings.

Apart from the housing numbers attached to Local Service Centres, development will be focused on the Secondary Villages in each Community Area. In addition, infill development will be permitted in the Small Villages of Barford St Martin, Bodenham,

<p>Britford, Chilmark, Figheldean/Ablington, Gomeldon, Middle Woodford, Newton Toney, Odstock, Orcheston, Stapleford, Steeple Langford, Wylve and Zeals. Appropriate exception development, based on identified local need, will also be permitted in these villages.</p> <p>New housing will not be permitted outside the settlements named in this policy.</p>
<p><b>Targets:</b> Qualitative: The delivery of levels of growth in conformity with the Settlement Strategy; average of 620 housing completions per year; 34% of housing completions per year to be on previously-developed land.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring and Review:</b> AMR &amp; Housing Trajectory, number of dwellings built in sustainable locations</p>
<p><b>Delivery Responsibility:</b> Wiltshire Council, Development Industry, Strategic Partnerships.</p>
<p><b>Policy replaced:</b> H1</p>

The SA noted that the policy sets out the spatial strategy for the plan and performs well against objectives relating to housing, employment and reduction in carbon emissions. Because it is a strategic policy, only the impact on strategic objectives could be appraised. However, it was noted that the policy is set out in a way that would guide a sustainable pattern of development. No mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made.

No requirement was identified for examination of this policy at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

The policy as drafted above should therefore form the basis of the settlement strategy policy within the Core Strategy.