

**SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY (REVIEW) EiP**

**ISSUE 6**

**NETHERHAMPTON ROAD AND LONGHEDGE**

**HEARING STATEMENT**

**Respondent No. 812:**

**Savills, on behalf of Barratt Southern Counties**

July 2011



**1. What evidence is there to support the deletion of the site South of Netherhampton Road and part of the site at Longhedge as opposed to other sites?**

**What alternatives to the deletion of these sites have been considered and why were they rejected?**

- 1.1 The two Matters have been responded to together within this Hearing Statement.
- 1.2 Neither Savills nor Barratt Southern Counties wish to comment on the site specific merits of deleting land South of Netherhampton Road or part of the site at Longhedge from Core Policy 2. This is a matter for the Council to comment on at the Hearing Sessions.
- 1.3 In respect of the Council's proposed amendments and the alternatives to such, this process is of course dictated by the level of change the Council is seeking to its housing and employment land requirement. Clearly, the Council feels it necessary to reduce the level of housing and employment land to be allocated within the Core Strategy. Through Topic Paper 20, it has sought to justify this approach; to this end Savills and Barratt Southern Counties support the retention of the Strategic Allocation at Hampton Park II and indeed the Council's continued acknowledgement that this site is required to deliver its front loaded strategy.
- 1.4 While the Inspector will be aware that against the SW RSS requirement, the Council has previously supported and sought to justify all of the Strategic Allocations within the submitted Core Strategy as being suitable and necessary, it is only the Hampton Park II allocation which has the ability to deliver completions in the short term. Until recently, no other Strategic Allocation has been subject to detailed discussion regarding delivery and the subject of a Planning Application. It is understood however, that a Planning Application for the UKLF site has recently been submitted to Wiltshire Council for consideration.
- 1.5 Throughout the production of the Core Strategy, the merits and suitability of the Hampton Park II Strategic Allocation was not subject to significant, or even one could describe as moderate levels of objection. In presenting the submission Core Strategy to Full Council in November 2009, Officers acknowledged that comments received during the previous consultation period on the Strategic Allocation's were '*very low in numbers*', (Para 3.4, Full Council Committee Paper - South Wiltshire Core Strategy Appendix 2).
- 1.6 We know from the Council's evidence in March 2010 that Salisbury City is constrained environmentally, and thus those sites identified to come forward represented those which offered the most appropriate spatial strategy in respect of housing and employment delivery. In supporting the delivery of Hampton Park II in March 2010, and indeed re-affirming this on 22 February 2011 Full Council Committee, the Council took comfort no doubt in the fact that this

strategic allocation had been the subject of public consultation on no less than four occasions since 2007.

- 1.7 Since this extensive Core Strategy consultation stretching back to 2007 and Examination in Public was completed in March 2010, the deliverability of the Hampton Park II Strategic Allocation has been thoroughly assessed through the S.78 Appeal Process. At the time of the closure of the Inquiry, there remained only two reasons for refusal; the first imposed by Members during the consideration of the Application at Committee regarding residential development on a greenfield site, which Officers offered no defence at the Inquiry (due to opposing views with Members), and a second relating to internal highway configuration. Consequently, it would be in direct conflict if the Council having presented its evidence at the EiP (March 2010) and the S.78 Inquiry to have now questioned the suitability of this Strategic Allocation. It was also acknowledged at the S.78 Inquiry that the Appeal Site remains the most advanced in respect of being able to deliver housing and make up for the shortfall of land supply that currently exists against any of the housing requirements that could be used.
- 1.8 The Council cannot negate on its evidence presented at the EiP in March 2010 in respect of Hampton Park II and indeed the suitability of the other Strategic Allocations. Through the content of Topic Paper 20, the Council has assessed the merits of the Strategic Allocations and thus concluded that the Strategic Allocation and Hampton Park remains one necessary and suitable to deliver 500 houses. It also states at Paragraph 12.16 of Topic Paper that there are no sound planning reasons to reduce the quantum of development either. We concur with this conclusion, that as an alternative strategy, there is no sound planning reason why the Strategic Allocation at Hampton Park should be amended or deleted from the Core Strategy. To do so, would be at odds with the evidence base and importantly the SA prepared by the Local Authority in forming its Core Strategy.