

3rd Party proof statement	Rebuttal
<p>Issue 5 - Implications for Strategic Allocations and Infrastructure</p> <p>The proposed change to Core Policy 2 – Strategic Allocations which reduces the provision of dwellings on the Longhedge (Old Sarum) site from 800 dwellings down to 450, is considered to be unsound and poorly thought through. The proposed change has been made without any reference to the landowner and is based upon an unclear 'change of heart' by the Local planning Authority.</p> <p>The implications of the proposed reduction in housing numbers at Longhedge should be seen as prejudicial to the proper planning of this strategic site as no proper regard has been given to the impact of trying to create an unbalanced mixed development that would be severely curtailed in an arbitrary manner and would result in a 'semi-developed site'. The proposed change would therefore seriously jeopardise the provision of a comprehensive and well-structured development comprising both market and affordable housing, employment provision, infrastructure and community facilities and would therefore cast doubt on the delivery and ultimate success in terms of quality of development and provision to meet community needs.</p>	<p>There is a general section at beginning of smiths gore's statements – presumably these will be dealt with under matter 6.</p> <p>The reduction in housing numbers and corresponding sites is justified within TOP/20.</p> <p>Why? There is no reason why the landowner cannot plan for the full area, even if just 450 are released in this plan. The SWCS review identifies the rest of longhedge as a strategic reserve and this should give the landowner certainty to do this. In addition part of the reason for longhedge being 'delayed' is due to important landscape considerations and this delay will enable the landowner to plan comprehensively whilst also initiating structural landscaping that can then have time to establish prior to any building.</p>

The fact that the Council refer to the potential for the remaining part of the Longhedge site to be brought forward, either at a later date, or as part of a contingency provision should other sites, or windfall provision, fail to deliver, is a contradictory and inconsistent position for them to adopt. It confirms that there is no fundamental issue with developing the whole site and providing 800 dwellings in conjunction with the 8 hectares of employment land. In itself, the suggestion that the 'second part' of the Longhedge site would be considered as an additional phase clearly confirms that the whole Longhedge site, as previously stated by the Council, is acceptable for development and therefore any new arguments presented to suggest that from an environmental perspective the original allocation is a reason for reducing the number of houses is spurious and illogical.

It is the conclusion of Council, as referred to within their Topic paper 20, that "All the strategic allocations were found to be sustainable otherwise they would not have been allocated in the first place" (see page 29). In this regard, therefore, where is the imperative to try to find fault with that carefully researched and thought out assessment. If the impact in respect of the environmental constraints has been found, on balance, to be acceptable then surely there is no need to strive to reduce the numbers of dwellings in order to safeguard the environmental setting of the City.

Yes, the council have never said it is not acceptable, just that it is not needed now. The environmental evidence was re-visited in more detail in order to determine which site / sites where then the least favoured in an are of high environmental constraint.

Longhedge did score well in TOP/20 in terms of the sustainability appraisal, but when re-considering the options the heritage impacts and transport were considered to be more important than some of the other positive outcomes. The in effect delay will allow the landowner to deliver landscaping that is well established before development occurs on the upper reaches of the site.