



WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

**SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY REVIEW
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

**HEARING STATEMENT
IN RESPECT OF ISSUE 5**

**IMPLICATIONS FOR STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS AND
INFRASTRUCTURE**

**PREPARED BY PRO VISION PLANNING AND DESIGN ON
BEHALF OF BEMERTON FARMS**

Ref: HS/Pro Vision Planning and Design/2845/5

Date: July 2011

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NO</u>
Hearing Statement	1 - 5

COPYRIGHT: The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the prior written consent of PRO Vision Planning & Design.

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY EIP

ISSUE 5: IMPLICATIONS FOR STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

POSITION STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF BEMERTON FARMS

What are the implications of the revised housing and employment figures on the delivery of the Strategic Allocations identified in the Core Strategy and the infrastructure associated with these, including the Transport Strategy?

1. Transport Strategy

1.1 Paragraphs 2.4 – 2.9 of our May 2011 representations set out Bemerton Farms' concerns regarding infrastructure provision, particularly in terms of highways.

1.2 New transportation infrastructure would be funded predominantly by financial contributions from the strategic sites. The Strategy is based on a cumulative funding, cumulative effect and cumulative impact. The Revised CS now proposes 21% reduction in housing provision on strategic sites, and by 25% on strategic greenfield sites which would reasonably be expected to generate the highest financial contributions per dwelling. The consequent knock on effect on funding could well compromise the viability of the Transport Strategy.

1.3 The 'Briefing Note for Salisbury Transport Model'¹ states that the next stage of the transport modelling work is to develop a Transport Strategy for Salisbury and that this would be prepared in early 2010. This has not happened, although the Highway Authority say they are currently working on a revised Transport Study that will take into account the proposed reduction in housing and employment figures.

1.4 Thus at this stage the most up-to-date information regarding highway infrastructure provision is the Salisbury Transport Strategy Options Assessment Report (January 2010).

1.5 There are relevant points to be drawn from this document which we have set out under the Section headings of the report.

2. Role of the Options Assessment Report

2.1 Paragraph 1.8 states that whilst the "Established Approach" and "Radical Option" are not opposites, they provide a means of comparing a continuation of established policies in the financially constrained environment against a range of radical measures that relies

¹ Dated January 2010

more heavily upon developer funding". The recommendation of the Options Assessment Report is that **the "Radical Option" is that which meets all aims and objectives and should be adopted to support the Core Strategy.**

3. Study Objectives, Interventions and Metrics

3.1 Paragraph 2.2 acknowledges that the starting point for the study objectives was the Wiltshire LTP3 objectives but an additional objective of affordability and deliverability has been added.

3.2 Paragraph 2.3 sets out the primary, secondary and tertiary objectives of the Transport Study. The development of land south of Netherhampton Road would help to meet these objectives as follows:

a) *To support and help improve the vitality, viability and resilience of Salisbury's economy;*

- One of the principal strands of the Core Strategy is the redevelopment of Churchfields; Salisbury's major industrial estate. As explained in Section 4 of our May 2011 representations this is an ambitious proposal and one that mixed use development at land south of Netherhampton (including 10 hectares of employment) would help to deliver.

b) *To provide support and promote a choice of sustainable transport alternatives and to reduce the need to travel by car*

- The sustainability of land south of Netherhampton Road was assessed in detail as part of our representations at the Proposed Submission Stage (September 2009). In summary the site is within easy walking distance of a range of services, facilities and employment locations, including the City Centre, and is more accessible by non-car modes than the other strategic sites.

c) *To ensure that the Salisbury Transport Strategy is affordable and capable of being delivered*

- The Strategy is based on cumulative funding, cumulative effect and cumulative impact. The proposed 20% reduction in housing numbers and knock on effect on funding could compromise the viability and delivery of the Transport Strategy.

d) *To reduce the impact of traffic on people's quality of life and Salisbury's built and natural environment and to encourage the efficient and sustainable distribution of freight around Salisbury.*

- *The "Radical Option" would achieve a reduction in traffic through Harnham, which is a concern of Harnham residents; a pared down strategy might well not achieve this (and may even increase traffic through Harnham?)*

4. Radical Option

- 4.1 Paragraph 5.3 sets out the guiding feature of the Radical Option which is to accommodate growth in the most sustainable manner possible whilst improving economic vitality.
- 4.2 Paragraph 5.4 states that *“essential to this is the ability to accommodate growth whilst locking-in benefits of the improvements. Demand management, smarter choices, public transport and park and ride improvements would contribute to reducing demand for highways traffic and ITS would focus upon locking-in traffic reductions rather than inducing additional traffic”*.
- 4.3 It is not at all clear from this to what extent the proposed package of highway works would work if funding is substantially reduced.
- 4.4 Both the Established Approach and Radical Option are city wide strategies in order to deal with city wide transportation problems. It may well not be possible to simply remove one individual element and expect the comprehensive proposals to remain viable or effective.
- 4.5 Paragraphs 5.20 to 5.58 set out the key aspects of the transport strategy which will require the most significant developer contributions, including:
- Traffic management;
 - Network improvements;
 - Intelligent transport systems;
 - Public transport;
 - Bus routes;
 - Bus infrastructure;
- 4.6 There is however no assessment or indication as to what extent this collective set of measures would succeed or fail as a complete package i.e. if the scope of the package is reduced because the funding has been reduced, would this reduce the effectiveness of the measures to a greater degree than the reduction in the amount of traffic arising because the amount of development has been reduced?
- 4.7 With specific reference to land south of Netherhampton Road paragraph 5.54 states that as part of the radical option there would be a high frequency (six an hour) bus service from the proposed Hampton Park development to the proposed development at land south of Netherhampton Road² with three services an hour serving Salisbury Station. It is not clear to what extent this route relies on the land south of Netherhampton Road site

² A typo in the report incorrectly states south of Harnham Road

coming forward or whether the service would simply run from the City Centre to Hampton Park.

5. Performance against Objectives

- 5.1 Paragraphs 6.2 – 6.54 of the Report compare the Established Approach against the Radical Approach in respect of the five primary objectives. In each case it concludes that the Radical Approach would be much more successful. It concludes that the Established Approach would actually make it more difficult for people to get into the City Centre and so it projects a likely decrease in the number of people visiting the City Centre. This would clearly be contrary to one of the key objectives of the Core Strategy which is to deliver a thriving economy.
- 5.2 In contrast, the Radical Option, if successful in achieving a significant modal shift, would actually increase the number of people accessing the City whilst reducing traffic levels. Thus, contrary to local views, development of land south of Netherhampton Road would in fact (if progressed) contribute towards a transportation strategy which would reduce the impact of traffic on the existing residents of Harnham, not increase it.

6. Performance of the Identified Options

- 6.1 Paragraph 7.11 concludes that the Radical Option would cost more to both implement and operate than the Established Approach. The paragraph does however go on to say ***“ although further work is required on scheme costs, it is considered affordable within the expected envelope of total funding likely to be available from local sources, providing funding is secured through an appropriate levy mechanism on new developments”***.
- 6.2 The Salisbury Transport Strategy Options Assessment Report (January 2010) was written on the basis of proposals for 12,400 new dwellings and 13,900 new jobs. The conclusions reached at paragraph 7.11 are therefore clearly based upon a significantly higher level of development and thus developer contributions than that now proposed.
- 6.3 The proposed Strategy is based on a cumulative funding, cumulative effect and cumulative impact. The proposed 20% reduction in housing numbers and knock on effect on funding could compromise the viability of the Transport Strategy.
- 6.4 In order to maximise opportunities to meet Government’s overarching aim to deliver sustainable development the Radical Option should be pursued – this is acknowledged by the Council themselves in Section 6 of the report where it is concluded that when compared in respect of the five primary objectives the Radical Approach would be the more successful. The Established Option would in fact go against the aims of PPG13 by decreasing accessibility to the City Centre and its services and facilities.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 The “Radical Option” has been demonstrated by the Options Assessment Paper as being necessary to achieve the aims and objectives of the CS. It is the essential means of achieving a modal shift towards sustainable transport.
- 7.2 It requires a significant investment from developer contributions, primarily from greenfield housing sites. Therefore the relationship between the amount of greenfield housing and the ability to fund the “Radical Option” is potentially fundamental to the CS.
- 7.3 In the absence (at the time of writing) of any assessment as to the effect on this relationship of the proposed 25% reduction in greenfield housing at Salisbury and Wilton, the Inspector must follow the precautionary principle and conclude the Revised CS is unsound in that respect. The only way to make the CS sound in that respect is to reinstate the 25% reduction of strategic greenfield housing which FOC/4 proposes to delete.