



# Review of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Topic Paper 20

January 2011

# Contents

	Page	
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Context and background	3
3.0	Given the flexibility and contingency in the SWCS, why the review?	6
4.0	The review methodology	6
5.0	Stage 1: review of growth needs in South Wiltshire	7
6.0	Stage 2: Review of the underpinning strategy	10
7.0	Balancing the need for growth with environmental constraints and community aspirations in South Wiltshire	11
8.0	Conclusions - why the SWCS growth figures should be reduced	15
9.0	How 9900 houses and 10,400 jobs should be distributed across South Wiltshire	16
10	Review of strategic site allocations	23
11	Methodology for reviewing Strategic Site Allocations	26
12	Consideration of results and implications for Strategy	38
13	The balance of housing needed as an result of the review and implications for 5 year land supply	42
14	Implications for contingency	42
		Page
	<i>Table 1: Revised Employment Land Requirement 2006-2026</i>	9
	<i>Table 2: Affordable Housing Annual Need and Shortfall in South Wiltshire</i>	13
	<i>Table 3: Numbers of secondary settlements in each community area</i>	19
	<i>Table 4: Numbers of secondary settlements in each community area and distribution of numbers</i>	20
	<i>Table 5: Comparison to Core Strategy Submission Figures with reviewed figures</i>	20
	<i>Table 6: Comparison to Core Strategy Submission Figures – Employment in hectares</i>	22
	<i>Table 7: Balance of housing needed compared to Core Strategy allocations</i>	24
	<i>Table 8: Strategic Allocations Scores for Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</i>	31
	<i>Table 9: Scoring results for assessment against SA criteria</i>	33
	<i>Table 10: Scoring results for assessment against landscape criteria</i>	34
	<i>Table 11: Summary of the risk to the historic environment overall, and the risk to potential archaeology of each proposed development site</i>	35
	<i>Table 12: Scoring results for assessment against heritage criteria</i>	36
	<i>Table 13: Scoring results for assessment against transport criteria</i>	36
	<i>Table 14: Scoring results for assessment against consultation criteria</i>	37
	<i>Table 15: Scoring results for assessment against water/flooding criteria</i>	37
	<i>Table 16: Scoring results for assessment against biodiversity/wildlife criteria</i>	38
	<i>Table 17: Scoring results for assessment against place shaping criteria</i>	38
	<i>Table 18: Results of appraisals for each Strategic Site Allocation</i>	38
	<i>Table 19: Balance of housing needed compared to revised Core Strategy Allocations</i>	42
	<b>Maps:</b>	
	Map 1: Potential Areas for Strategic Growth in and around Salisbury/Wilton	27
	<b>Appendices:</b>	
	Appendix 1 – Appraisal of Strategic Site Allocations	47
	Appendix 2 – Summary of Key Changes	87

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.0 The purpose of this paper is to explain the review process that the Submission Draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS) has been subject to in response to the changing national planning advice, in particular the intention to abolish the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (SWRSS). It sets out the response that Wiltshire Council proposes to make to these changes, the methodology that has been used to ensure objective scrutiny of the strategy, and the conclusions that have been reached. It takes account of new evidence that has emerged since the initial Examination-in-Public (EIP) of the SWCS in March/April 2010 and explains how changes should be made to the strategy in order to ensure it addresses the changing circumstances, and assesses the nature of those changes against the criteria set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008

## 2.0 Context and background

- 2.0 The review of the Submission Draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS) has been undertaken as a direct response to the Secretary of States published intention to abolish the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (SWRSS). It is this intention, especially with regards to potential implications on housing and employment figures, that was agreed as the basis for the review with the Inspector overseeing the Examination in Public (EIP). It is the case that growth figures in the Submission Draft of the SWCS were based on and in conformity with the figures contained in the last published version of the draft SWRSS. This situation has now been further complicated by High Court action as explained under part (a) below.
- 2.1 In accordance with paragraph 4.52 of PPS12, in order for core strategies to be “sound” it is necessary for it to demonstrate that it is consistent with national planning policy (PPS12, Paragraph 4.33). Therefore it is necessary for the review to assess what impact changes to national policy may have on the strategy and to explore any amendments that may be necessary in response to ensure it is sound.

### (a) Intention to Revoke the draft SWRSS

- 2.2 On 6 July 2010 the Communities and Local Government (CLG) Secretary revoked the draft SWRSS by way of an order laid before Parliament. In a letter from DCLG containing guidance to all Local Planning Authorities (6 July 2010) it was confirmed that “*Local planning authorities will be responsible for establishing the right level of housing provision in their area, and identifying long-term supply of housing land without the burden of regional housing targets*”.

- 2.3 Following the decision of the High Court in *Cala Homes (South) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2010] on 10 November 2010 the Chief Planner at CLG wrote to the Chief Planning Officers of local authorities in England saying:

*“Status of letter to Chief Planning Officers*

*Local planning authorities and planning inspectors should be aware that the Secretary of State has received a judicial review challenge to his statement of 10 November 2010, the letter of the Chief Planner of the same date and to the Secretary of State's letter of 27 May 2010 on the ground that the Government's intended revocation of Regional Strategies by the promotion of legislation for that purpose in the forthcoming Localism Bill is legally immaterial to the determination of planning applications and appeals prior to the revocation of Regional Strategies.*

*The Secretary of State is defending the challenge and believes and is advised that it is ill founded. Nevertheless, pending determination of the challenge, decision makers in local planning authorities and at the Planning Inspectorate will in their determination of planning applications and appeals need to consider whether the existence of the challenge and the basis of it, affects the significance and weight which they judge may be given to the Secretary of State's statements and to the letter of the Chief Planner.*

*The Secretary of State will notify the determination of the Court once it has been made. This is currently expected to be by the end of January 2011.”*

- 2.4 CALA Homes lodged further judicial review proceedings seeking to challenge the lawfulness of the advice in this letter and this was heard on Friday 3 December 2010. The Judge required that the following be published on the CLG and Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') websites:

*“I am writing to you today following the judgement in the case brought by CALA Homes in the High Court, which considered that the powers set out in section 79 [6] of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 could not be used to revoke all Regional Strategies in their entirety.*

*The effect of this decision is to re-establish Regional Strategies as part of the development plan. However the Secretary of State wrote to Local Planning Authorities and to the Planning Inspectorate on 27 May 2010 informing them of the Government's intention to abolish Regional Strategies in the Localism Bill and that he expected them to have regard to this as a material consideration in planning decisions.*

*Local Planning Authorities and the Planning Inspectorate should still have regard*

- 2.5 Following this a further challenge was made by CALA Homes, which was not accepted by the High Court. In the judgment (7 February 2011), in referring to the distinction between materiality and weight of the draft SWRSS it states that: “...matters of planning judgement are within the exclusive province of the local planning authority or the Secretary of State” (paragraph 29). As such, as

evidenced by the review in this paper only limited weight should be given to the housing and employment requirements within the draft SWRSS.

#### (b) Introduction of the Localism Bill

2.6 The Localism Bill was published in December 2010 following the change of government and an introduction of the localism agenda. The Localism Bill introduces a package of reforms that seek to devolve greater power to local authorities, town and parish councils and to local communities. The Bill is expected to establish new rights, introduce changes to the planning system, and increase the role for communities to influence planning decisions. The bill had its second reading in Parliament in January 2011. Key proposals of the Bill are as follows:

a) Abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy - the Bill outlines the removal of the primary legislation which sets the basis for regional spatial strategies.

b) Neighbourhood planning - the Bill proposes a new tier of planning, to be known as 'neighbourhood planning' which will be led by the community, with support from the local planning authority. Three new types of plan are proposed; Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs); Neighbourhood Development Orders (NDOs); and Community Right to Build Orders (CRTBOs). These new plans will be prepared collaboratively between the local authority and local community and will allow the community to have a greater say in how their areas are shaped and planned for. Neighbourhood Plans are expected to be led by town or parish councils, but could be led by 'Neighbourhood Forums' if no town or parish councils are in place.

c) Town or parish councils would apply to the local authority with proposals for preparing neighbourhood plans and the local authority will have a duty to provide appropriate support. This will help to ensure the plans are in compliance with appropriate legal requirements.

d) Neighbourhood plans will need to be consistent with national planning policy and be in general conformity of the local plan (Wiltshire Core Strategy), on strategic matters. Neighbourhood plans will therefore be unable to opt out of identified strategic growth.

e) It is proposed that neighbourhood plans would be assessed by a new form of independent examination to ensure legal compliance and consistency with national and local plans. This would be managed by the local authority who would appoint an appropriate independent assessor to run the examination process.

f) Providing the plan meets the necessary requirements (outlined above), a referendum would also be held to ensure it had public support. The plan would be adopted providing there was a simple majority in favour.

2.7. It is interesting to note that the Inspector overseeing the Examination in Public for the Bristol Core Strategy has introduced questions on how 'localism' has been taken into account in the preparation of that document.

2.8 It is therefore reasonable to take the spirit of the localism agenda into account in undertaking the review of the SWCS. The review has been undertaken in the spirit of the localism agenda, with particular regard to the

views of local communities. Wiltshire Council believes that it was appropriate to revisit the consultation responses from earlier stages of preparing the SWCS together with other new evidence in the completion of the review.

- 2.9 In summary, Wiltshire Council recognises that changes are likely to be introduced to the planning system in light of the Coalition Government's introduction of the localism agenda and consider that it was appropriate to undertake a review. The review that took place after the EIP was suspended was necessary given that the Draft South West RSS is unlikely to be adopted. The importance of establishing a clear strategic planning framework in South Wiltshire remains critical in providing certainty in planning strategic growth within this part of Wiltshire.

### **3.0 Given the flexibility and contingency in the SWCS, why the review?**

- 3.1 Whilst, as argued at the EIP, the Council believes the SWCS to be a flexible document that can respond to changing circumstances, it is the case that in order to be sound it had to demonstrate compliance with the growth levels set out in the draft SWRSS. The level of growth planned for was at the upper extent of what could be considered appropriate in the highly constrained environment of South Wiltshire. National policy objectives in PPS1 emphasise the need to bring forward growth in a sustainable manner, that is, in a manner that delivers important growth that an area needs but in a way which respects the particular constraints that are specific to that area. The duty of compliance with the draft SWRSS highlighted tensions within the community over the ability to achieve this sustainable growth, with a feeling that the level of building proposed in the draft SWRSS would be greater than the environments ability to absorb it in a sustainable manner. Given that the need to comply with the draft SWRSS will no longer exist, an evidence based review (using up to date information) should ascertain whether South Wiltshire requires the levels of growth proposed in the SWCS.

### **4.0 The review methodology**

- 4.1 The review has been conducted using the following methodology:
- Consider all evidence that related to projected growth rates for both homes and jobs in South Wiltshire and in particular focus on new evidence produced since the publication of the SWCS submission draft.
  - Review the evidence to examine whether the underpinning rationale of the SWCS (that of frontloaded managed growth) is still the right course of action.
  - Review how the growth challenges faced in South Wiltshire can be best accommodated to effectively strike a balance between the growth needed to meet the challenges of South Wiltshire with the limited ability of the environment to absorb growth in a sustainable manner. The central outcome sought here will be to manage the growth required in the most

sustainable way in order to comply with PPS1. This stage will also take account of the weight that should be given to representations received during the consultation.

- Consider the findings of the process and whether these merit making changes to the SWCS and if so, summarise them and assess their scale and nature against the criteria set out in the 2008 Regulations (as set out in the PAS Plan Making Toolkit).

## 5.0 Review of growth needs in South Wiltshire

- 5.1 On 27 May 2010 the Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) announced the Coalition Government's intention to "rapidly abolish Regional Strategies (RS) and informed Councils that:

*"This intention to revoke Regional Strategies (RS) will mean that "Local Planning Authorities will be responsible for establishing the right level of local housing provision in their area, and identifying a long term supply of housing land without the burden of regional targets."*

- 5.2 In response to this, Wiltshire Council committed to undertaking a comprehensive review of the housing requirement for Wiltshire (Cabinet, 19 October 2010). This section outlines the rationale that the Council has used to determine housing and job growth levels for Wiltshire and the South Wiltshire area.
- 5.4 There are two factors which are key influences on this piece of work. Firstly, Wiltshire Council is producing a Core Strategy for the whole of its area, of which the policies within the SWCS will form a part. It is therefore necessary to understand that the methodology employed is Wiltshire wide and consistent, and that any geographical variations in outcomes will be explained through spatially distinctive local factors. Secondly it is important to emphasise that meeting the total identified housing and job needs in South Wiltshire hasn't been pursued through the SWCS Submission draft. It has always been the Council's case that meeting need as expressed in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, even for affordable housing, is beyond the environmental capacity of the area. The constraints and availability of brownfield land has not materially altered and hence it is still the case that the SWCS needs to make the most effective progress towards meeting local needs in an environmentally responsible manner, rather than simply plan to meet it outright.

**(a) Housing requirement**

- 5.5 The strategic housing requirement for the whole of Wiltshire has been proposed to be within the range 35,900 to 43,200. From this a figure has been derived for South Wiltshire.
- 5.6 The strategic requirement was developed through a number of steps. Firstly through considering the number of dwellings that would be required to provide for the projected employment growth based on figures produced by Cambridge Econometrics, who performed the similar function in the draft SWRSS. This range (35,900 to 57,800) was then refined by considering what could be demonstrated to be realistic and achievable given the spatial characteristics of Wiltshire. The results of this analysis reduced the maxima of this range to 43,200. However, as this is so close to the need arising from the projected population (42,900); it was decided to use this latter figure as the maxima. This ensures that the requirement range has the potential to meet the needs arising from the projected population, provide for the employment growth, and begin to address affordability and affordable supply.
- 5.7 In South Wiltshire, a large amount of work has been undertaken to assess what proportion of the number of dwellings required to support the employment growth can realistically be achieved, given the constrained environment. This work is set out in Topic Papers 19 on the Site Selection Process, and revisited in Section 7 of this paper below. As has been consistently argued throughout the process by the Council, there is a need to balance growth levels against constraints in a sensitive way. The delivery of new dwellings should be maximised within the constraints to ensure that the economic prospects are addressed as far as is possible. Indeed this is a fundamental part of national policy, in planning sustainably for the long term as set out in PPS1.
- 5.8 The housing requirement for South Wiltshire should be in line with that which is considered to be deliverable, namely 8,900 to 10,600 as this will at least provide for the needs of the population, and is potentially deliverable, and although this does not meet the projected employment growth, it does seek to maximise the growth within the constraints considered. The demand created by the additional military population is likely to support the housing market in this area and so further housing should be able to be delivered to meet this specific need. However, given that the maximum of the range is already so ambitious it is considered that this should be maintained. An assumption has been made that a similar level of housing is likely to be required per military employee as that estimated in Tidworth, creating demand for an additional 300 dwellings. The resulting range for a housing requirement within South Wiltshire is therefore 9,200 to 10,600. In the development of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy a single figure is required. It would be overly ambitious if this was towards the top of the range, as this delivery estimate is reliant upon fundamental societal changes. Rather, a figure somewhere in the middle of this range is considered appropriate (9,900). This level of delivery can be seen to maximise the employment potential given the delivery constraints and provides for the projected population increase.
- 5.9 Delivery of this order is ambitious, as is demonstrated when compared to the targets in the Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 which are 400 dwellings per annum (as compared to 495 dwellings). This represents a rise

of some 22.5% and maintains the step-change approach which has always underpinned the SWCS.

- 5.10 This figure is consistent with the strategic requirement to prioritise economic growth, and provides for the increase in resident population based on trends linked to factors such as decreasing household size and increased life expectancy.

**(b) Job and employment land requirement**

- 5.11 The draft SWRSS was based on projections produced by Cambridge Econometrics and required the Salisbury HMA (former Salisbury District area) to deliver 13,900 jobs, 400 of which should be within the Mere and Tisbury community areas with the remainder being within the Salisbury Travel to Work Area (see RPP/02, page 117-118). These projections were produced in 2006, prior to the commencement of the 2008 recession.
- 5.12 Owing to the recession, the intention to abolish the draft SWRSS and the opportunity given to the Council to review figures, it is prudent to review the employment figures as well as housing. Revised economic projections have been commissioned from Cambridge Econometrics that take account of more recent events in the economy. These have been produced on the former district council areas and indicate that for the whole of Wiltshire 27,600 new jobs could be delivered over the period 2006 – 2026.
- 5.13 The re-run figures (see ‘Review of Employment Projections and Land Requirements’ STU/11B) show a revised projection indicating a growth of 10,400 jobs between 2006 and 2026 in South Wiltshire, a reduction of 3,500 jobs from the draft SWRSS figures. This is expected given the slow down and / or negative growth now being experienced within the local economy as a result of the 2008 recession. The projected job growth is split between 41 different industry sectors. Within the employment review paper (STU/11B) the new projected job growth has been translated into a new employment land requirement using the same methodology as that used within the Salisbury District Employment Land Review (ELR) (STU//11). The Examination in Public in the Spring of 2010 implied that using the ELR would be a sound methodology to base employment land assumptions upon. This work has been undertaken for the whole period (2006 – 2026) as well as for 5 year increments during this period and the results of this is provided in the table below:

*Table 1: Revised Employment Land Requirement 2006-2026*

Business Use Class	Land Requirement in Hectares				
	2006-2011	2011-2016	2016-2021	2021-2026	2006-2026
B1 Business	3.4	4.5	8.8	7.6	24.3
B2 General Industrial	-4	0.6	0.0	-0.8	-4.3
B8 Storage and Distribution	-1.3	0.2	0.6	0.2	-0.4
Total	-2.0	5.3	9.4	6.9	20.45

- 5.14 This clearly shows that a reduction in the employment land required by the draft SWRSS (37ha) to around 20 ha is justified by the latest evidence. It reflects the effect of the recession with a negative land requirement between

2006 to 2010 and growth beginning to pick up again in 2011, peaking in the 2016-2021 period. This is different to the figures for the draft SWRSS based projections which showed the majority of employment growth taking place by 2011 (table 63, page 139 of STU/11), whereas more recent projections show clear contraction in economic output during this period as well as a change in sector growth resulting in a further reduction in land requirement. The result being that less employment land is needed at a much slower rate than previously envisaged.

## **6.0 Review of the underpinning strategy**

- 6.1 The evidence, as collated in the set of themed topic papers prepared to support the SWCS, has been revisited in conjunction with the outcome of the review of growth requirements.
- 6.2 The pressures have not changed. There is the pressure for homes caused by an ageing population that must be planned for, together with young families and first time buyers finding it difficult to get on the housing ladder. There is still the need to plan for economic growth by providing the right choices for business that deliver an attractive investment environment and to support the Salisbury Vision through providing new employment (decant) sites. The latest retail evidence still indicates that Salisbury needs a significant boost in its retail offer to avoid decline in the face of increased sub-regional competition. Regeneration of the UKLF site is paramount for future prosperity of Wilton, as is maintaining the strategy of balanced growth in Amesbury. It is clear that the villages should support modest, high quality, growth commensurate with their role and function.
- 6.3 The evidence and Sustainability Appraisal in particular is still relevant in that within the South Wiltshire context, Salisbury is the dominant settlement which offers by far the best range of services, employment, housing and transport choices. As such it should remain as the principle focus for growth. As discussed at the EIP hearing sessions, the amount and location of growth around Salisbury needs to be considered within the context of a highly constrained environment and the need to plan sustainably as set out in PPS1. This underlines the central theme of the Core Strategy, which is to achieve a step change in delivery of homes and jobs which makes the best progress towards meeting economic and affordable housing needs, while planning responsibly in a sustainable way. The underpinning strategy of making the best progress we can towards meeting growth needs within in the context of respecting environmental factors remains unaltered.
- 6.4 The SWCS's aim, explained within paragraph 5.18 of the SWCS (SWCS/01, page 48), of 'balanced growth based on mixed-use development' that delivers 'growth in a sustainable manner, which balances the delivery of new homes with new jobs and service provision' again remains unaltered. The importance of avoiding the coalescence of Salisbury with villages such as Laverstock, Ford, Netherhampton and Quidhampton is also still valid. This is detailed in paragraph 3.8 (a) of the SWCS (SWCS/01, page 24) 'Pressures on landscape' which states that 'the principle pressure to be addressed is ensuring that the new strategic growth required does not erode the separate identity, character and visual and functional amenity of settlements'. Where

any potential coalescence has been identified as a result of a strategic site allocation, this has been identified as a constraint in the relevant development template in Appendix A of the SWCS. All evidence which has been assessed in carrying out this review has indicated that these strategic objectives are sound and if anything needs strengthening. This supports the underpinning strategy of planning for self-containment and planning to ensure the character of satellite settlements to Salisbury, as distinct settlements is maintained.

- 6.5 As outlined in Section 5, delivery of the 9,900 dwellings is still ambitious, as is demonstrated when compared to the historic delivery rates, representing a 22% increase, which also maintains the step-change approach which has always underpinned to SWCS. The encouragement of early delivery of sites, (known as the 'frontloading' of the strategy), to meet the challenges faced in South Wiltshire has not and should not change.

## **7.0 Balancing the need for growth with environmental constraints and community aspirations in South Wiltshire**

- 7.1 Given the conclusions from the first stages of the review, it has been necessary to examine whether changes are needed to the strategy to reflect the reduction in growth from 12,400 to 9,900, homes and 13,900 to 10,400 jobs, or whether the SWCS is flexible enough to be able to absorb these without any further changes.
- 7.2 The starting point for this part of the review is to answer the question: given that some of the challenges facing South Wiltshire were contributed to by slow growth rates would it not be sensible just to continue with the strategy unchanged? That is, plan for an oversupply of housing.
- 7.3 There are several reasons why it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to plan for an oversupply of housing across South Wiltshire up to 2026. Many of these reasons overlap and are summarised below:

### **(a) Prudent use of the constrained environment in South Wiltshire**

- 7.4 The arguments were well rehearsed at the EIP that South Wiltshire generally and in particular the growth point of Salisbury, are highly constrained environments with few reasonable choices over how future expansion can take place in a sustainable manner as required by PPS1. Indeed, evidence indicates that there are no realistic alternatives to the growth strategy for Salisbury promoted in the SWCS. That being the case, it is clear that developable land is at a premium around Salisbury and in light of environmental constraints (such as flood zones, historic landscapes, nature conservation) should be viewed as a limited resource. Therefore in order to plan sustainably for the long term prosperity of Salisbury it is important that this resource be used carefully, so that options remain for future generations. Not to do so, will mean that the future needs of Salisbury will be difficult to meet other than by growth that causes environmental harm, which would be detrimental to the character of the area and cause coalescence with

neighbouring settlements, which clearly wish to retain their individual character (communities at Laverstock, Alderbury, Wilton, Netherhampton, Ford have all expressed this concern). Pursuing such a course would be clearly not in accordance with PPS1 (see paragraph 5). Therefore as has been consistently argued throughout the EIP, the judicious use of valuable developable land is important to ensure a steady supply of growth in the longer term, so that Salisbury can continue to thrive in a sustainable way.

**(b) There is no longer the requirement to plan for a “minimum” housing requirement**

- 7.5 Draft SWRSS Policy HMA 11 (Salisbury HMA) required provision for growth of at least 12,400 dwellings. The South Wiltshire Core Strategy had to conform to this (inter alia) to be found sound. By contrast, the DCLG letter and guidance of 6 July 2010 requires Local Planning Authorities to take responsibility for establishing the right level of local housing provision in their area. There is therefore no longer any requirement to accommodate housing numbers over and above this ‘right level’ simply in order to achieve ‘soundness’. This is another factor to consider in conjunction with all the others set out in this section, which indicate why a more careful approach to the release of land will represent a more appropriate and sustainable way in which to plan for South Wiltshire.

**(d) Recognition of Salisbury’s dominance in a predominantly rural area**

- 7.6 The draft SWRSS proposed a level of housing for South Wiltshire that, in our experience arising from consultations carried out during the Core Strategy process, had not surprisingly little support from the local community. This was in terms of both its source (i.e. the housing level was seen as ‘Government imposed’) and what it actually proposed. Furthermore, the draft SWRSS proposed a distribution of dwellings that did not fully reflect Salisbury’s dominance in a predominantly rural area.
- 7.7 The lower level of housing proposed in this review, with an increased focus on the city of Salisbury would be more appropriate to the characteristics of the area and representative of communities views. In summary the evidence through which the spatial settlement strategy has been derived and the extent of community representations indicate that the dominance of Salisbury to South Wiltshire had been undervalued in the draft SWRSS and that the split of housing it promoted of under 50% (6,000 net additional dwellings, compared to 12,400) of the total in Salisbury and the majority outside of the City did not adequately reflect the size, role and function of the settlements in South Wiltshire.
- 7.8 With the exception of Amesbury, the main settlements (local service centres) outside of Salisbury are in reality large villages, set in a rural area. Their capacity to absorb growth in a sustainable manner is limited. The difference in scale is demonstrated in Topic Paper 3, ‘Sustainable Settlement Strategy EIP Ref: TOP 3a), which shows that Salisbury has over 40 basic facilities; outside of Amesbury each local service centre has fewer than 10. Therefore this review will look again at the balance between where the growth should be focussed, within the revised housing requirement. Section 9 of this paper will cover the issue of the spatial approach to housing distribution in more detail

and explain the disaggregated approach being taken and the implications for the review.

### **(e) Level of Need identified in emerging SHMA**

- 7.9 The emerging Strategic Housing Market Assessment for South Wiltshire concludes that after taking account of existing stock turnover, the affordable need shortfall and market demand shortfall per annum over the next 10 years is as follows:

*Table 2: Affordable Housing Annual Need and Shortfall in South Wiltshire*

<b>Affordable need shortfall per annum</b>	<b>Market demand shortfall per annum</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
763	718	1481

- 7.10 Given the constraints of the area, leading to difficulty in identifying appropriate sites for even the previously proposed 12,400 dwellings, together with community views, it would not be appropriate to accommodate the level of dwellings required to satisfy this overall need (i.e. 29,620 over a 20 year period).
- 7.11 It is not unusual for SHMAs to indicate demand and need for housing over and above what can and should be planned for in an area. However, SHMAs provide a useful tool to ensure the right type of housing is built in the right location to meet the needs of local people, providing information to direct homes to the areas where they are most needed.
- 7.12 The review proposals therefore provide an approach that balance the need to deliver new homes (including affordable) within environmental constraints and acceptability to the local community.

### **(f) Trends in windfall delivery of housing supply**

- 7.13 The trend for delivery of windfall sites (windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as available in the development plan process, they comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available) in South Wiltshire has increased in the period between April 2006 and April 2010. PPS3 (paragraph 59) states that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. However, this trend needs to be monitored as there is a possibility that if it continues (even at reduced levels) that windfall could provide an important source of dwellings in the later stages of the plan.
- 7.14 Some 850 dwellings were delivered from windfall sources in the plan area between April 2006 and April 2010. The AMR (or successor) will review these figures on an annual basis and the Council will therefore be able to monitor the ongoing contribution that windfall development makes towards the delivery of housing targets. If windfall trends continue or indeed grow then this will make an important contribution to the latter stages of the strategy. Given the highly constrained environment it is therefore prudent to monitor delivery of windfall development as the plan progresses rather than to over-allocate

greenfield land at this stage. Should this source fail to make a contribution then the potential areas for development as identified on Map 1, page 28 (the green areas on the map as are included in the SWCS), would be the first place to consider allocating further land if needed. However, if the review identifies any sites previously identified within the SWCS that are no longer needed during this plan period, they would also provide a source of supply that could be drawn on.

### **(g) Impact on Water Supply Infrastructure**

- 7.15 Evidence which emerged during the EIP is of pertinence to this review. The debate did reveal that the surety of water supply given by Wessex Water was based on a lower growth figure than the Strategy was proposing. This questions the ability of water supply to meet the higher growth figures.
- 7.16 Paragraph 2.2 of Mr Adam's Amplified Written Statement pertaining to EIP Matter 5 refers to correspondence with Wessex Water, in which Mr Adam was given 'assurance of supply being calculated on a figure 32.5% lower' [than the 12,400 figure proposed in the draft SWRSS]. The overall number of dwellings in this review is 31% lower than the draft SWRSS figure and therefore will help mitigate the potential pressure on water supply infrastructure that oversupply could produce.

### **(i) Consideration of the Localism Bill**

- 7.17 The change of Government in 2010 brought in the localism agenda and the introduction of the Localism Bill in December 2010. The Localism Bill introduces a package of reforms that seek to devolve greater power and freedoms to councils and neighbourhoods, establish new rights for communities, action extensive changes to the planning system, and give communities greater say over planning decisions. This has just had its second reading. The proposals are summarised above in Section 2 of this document (page 5).
- 7.19 As explained in Section 2 of this review, it is considered reasonable to take the spirit of the localism agenda into account in undertaking this review. We have undertaken the review in the spirit of the localism agenda and subsequently the Localism Bill when it was introduced, with particular regard to the views of local communities. We are of the view that it was appropriate to revisit the previous consultation responses received together with other new evidence in completing the review.

### **(j) Local community representations**

- 7.20 Throughout the production of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy significant public and stakeholder consultation was undertaken. A further assessment of the consultation feedback has been made to determine whether there are key community issues which need to be reassessed, as they previously could not be given weight given the context of the draft SWRSS. In particular, the consultation responses received during the plan preparation period for each strategic site allocation has been assessed and this is summarised in the tables in Appendix 1.

- 7.21 Given the Government's clear direction of travel with the localism agenda, the weight that should be given to consultation responses made throughout the preparation of the SWCS has been reviewed. Whereas during previous stages of the process, consultation responses clearly did inform place shaping, the influence was limited by the fact that to be sound the SWCS had to comply with the draft SWRSS and deliver the levels of growth proposed. This did mean that if a community disagreed with key elements of the draft SWRSS there was limited scope for meeting their aspirations. This raised some clear tensions especially over the level and location of new growth during the production of the SWCS.
- 7.22 The consultation process is detailed in South Wiltshire Core Strategy Methodology and Output Report Incorporating Reg 30 1 d Statement, November 2009 (SWCS/10). The most common views of the community were expressed in the following themes:
- The growth levels with the draft SWRSS are too high for South Wiltshire and will erode the character of South Wiltshire
  - General support for the spatial strategy in the SWCS of focussing growth at Salisbury (if not the numbers).
  - Distributed of growth to existing settlements is preferred rather than a new settlement.
  - There is inadequate infrastructure to support such growth
- 7.23 While the general thrust of the comments support carrying out the review of the SWCS and especially reviewing the level of growth, it must be acknowledged that many comments received related to specific site allocations. These comments are revisited later in this review to assess what, if any changes are needed to the Strategic Site Allocations (SSAs) and included in the matrix at Appendix 1.

## **8.0 Conclusions - why the SWCS growth figures should be reduced**

- 8.1 As has been consistently argued by the Council, South Wiltshire is a highly constrained environment and finding developable land to meet local housing and employment needs in a sustainable manner that complies with PPS1 is difficult. The key factors which indicate why it is necessary to reduce the numbers from those in the draft SWRSS and SWCS submission draft are explained above, and are in summary:
- Prudent use of the constrained environmental capacity in South Wiltshire
  - The need to plan for sustainable growth that complies with the aims of PPS1
  - An improvement in housing delivery rates which has slightly eased the pressure for immediate growth
  - The intention to abolish the requirement to plan for a "minimum" housing requirement
  - Recognition of Salisbury's dominance in a predominantly rural area
  - Contribution of windfall delivery to housing supply
  - Impact on Water Supply Infrastructure

- Spirit of the localism agenda and weight that should now be given to the housing and employment figures within the draft SWRSS.
- 8.2 Taking all of the factors identified into account it is the logical conclusion that the opportunity should be taken to reduce the levels of growth in South Wiltshire, balancing a locally derived need based on up to date evidence with environmental capacity and community appetite.

## **9.0 How 9900 houses and 10,400 jobs should be distributed across South Wiltshire**

- 9.1 Having established that it is appropriate for the SWCS to deliver less growth than it currently identifies, the next step is to ascertain how the new housing and employment requirement of 9900 houses and 10,400 jobs should be distributed across South Wiltshire up to 2026. That is, if the numbers change, how does this affect the spatial strategy as set out in Core Policy 1 (see paragraph 5.17, page 45 of the SWCS submission document)? To assess this in a systematic manner the opportunity has been taken to review the underpinning methodology of the settlement strategy to see if any changes are necessary. This review has incorporated the following steps:

### **(a) Application of the Sustainable Settlement Strategy methodology**

- 9.2 In order to ensure consistency with the SWCS Submission Document, the lower housing figures have been subject to the same distribution methodology as that set out in Topic Paper 3, (EIP Ref: TOP3, a, b, c). This methodology, as examined at the EIP, uses the numbers of Basic Facilities located in settlements as a starting basis to inform the proposed settlement hierarchy and sustainable distribution of housing contained within the Core Strategy. This categorisation was based on the countywide Rural Facilities Survey of 2005, as updated in 2008.
- 9.3 It is important to emphasise that this examination of basic facilities provided a starting point for the methodology to determine appropriate distributions of growth for Salisbury, Amesbury and Local Service Centres identified in the SWCS. Subsequently, for each settlement an evaluation was undertaken to take into account a number of additional criteria to inform the ability of settlements to accept growth in a sustainable manner, including:
- Identified housing needs for settlements as identified through the Housing Needs and Market Survey EIP Ref: STU 03)
  - The role and function of the settlement including spatially distinctive groups such as Amesbury and the Garrison Villages
  - An appraisal of the environmental constraints and hence scope for accommodating levels of sustainable growth
  - The availability of deliverable sites as promoted through the SHLAA
  - Established local strategies, such as that of providing balanced growth of homes and jobs at Amesbury

- Community aspirations expressed through representations, such as supporting a strategy of dispersed growth, focussed on the most sustainable locations
- 9.4 A review of this methodology confirms it to be a sound way of distributing development and hence it has been used as the basis from which to distribute the new figure of 9,900 homes.

**(b) A consistent approach to addressing Housing Needs**

- 9.5 While the consideration of basic facilities was the key starting point for identifying a settlement hierarchy through role and function analysis, local housing needs were important criteria which was a central influence on the distribution of housing. In Topic Paper 3, Third Addendum (Paragraph 5 onwards), the Local Housing Needs and Market Survey of 2006 (LHNMS) was used as the basis to identify the housing needs within settlements and, importantly, the assess the level of affordable housing need. The amount of private dwellings needed to deliver affordable homes was identified to be some 1.5 private dwellings (which equates to 40% delivery of affordable homes). This was verified through the Viability Study (EIP Ref: STU 04
- 9.6 The LHNMS identified specific housing needs for a three year period on a community area (CA) basis, and this evidence was used as a basis through which housing numbers could be allocated to the basic hierarchy identified through the analysis of the spatial distribution of Basic Facilities.
- 9.7 New evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (STU/53) produced since the Submission of the SWCS clearly indicates that the distribution of need has not materially altered in relations to community areas. The SHMA reaffirms the appropriateness of the 'hierarchy' of need across the community areas (in simple terms of weight of numbers) and the relationship of communities as set out in Core Policy 1 of the SWCS Submission Document. This evidence is important in reaffirming the appropriateness of Core Policy 1 and that while housing numbers may change to reflect latest evidence, that the settlement hierarchy it sets out is still a sound one.

**(c) Joint consideration of the Salisbury and Wilton Community Areas**

- 9.8 During the Core Strategy process, preserving Wilton's identity as a separate settlement from Salisbury has remained a high priority. This was, for example, stressed in both Chapter 7 of the Core Strategy and the Development Templates for the Strategic Sites at Fugglestone Red and UKLF contained within Appendix A of the document.
- 9.9 Notwithstanding this, at the Preferred Option and Revised Preferred Options stages of the process, the Salisbury and Wilton CAs were considered in combination in terms of proposed housing distribution.
- 9.10 Although the Core Strategy attempted to separate the housing numbers for these two areas, we have reconsidered this approach. There was local concern that the proposed housing numbers suggested for the Wilton CA in

paragraph 7.10 of the Core Strategy could not have been accommodated without causing significant impact on the character and setting of Wilton and the other small rural settlements in the CA.

- 9.11 Paragraph 7.12 of the Core Strategy did in fact acknowledge this concern, stating that it might be possible to direct some of this housing towards Salisbury to help meet the needs of the CA in a more sustainable manner. Bearing this in mind we have reviewed the approach of separating these two community areas.
- 9.12 We remain of the view that existing population is not an important criterion for informing the sustainable distribution of development. However, it is noted that Wilton is the only settlement in its CA with a four figure population, whereas the Amesbury CA and South Wiltshire (the grouping of the other three CAs adjoining Salisbury) have 6 and 5 such settlements respectively, indicating the more rural nature of Wilton CA outside of Wilton itself.
- 9.13 Wilton itself is at the edge of its CA and, in terms of administrative boundaries, immediately adjoins Salisbury. The centre of the town is 3.5 miles from the centre of Salisbury, significantly closer than the other LSCs in the Core Strategy area (the next closest is Downton at 6.8 miles). It is therefore not surprising that a number of Salisbury's Basic Facilities are equally conveniently situated to also serve residents of the Wilton CA, and this explains why Wilton itself has fewer Basic Facilities than the other LSCs. Simply put, Wilton and Salisbury have a special functional relationship and while it is important to recognise their individual characteristics, the relationship should be acknowledged.
- 9.14 For the above reasons we are now of the view that the sustainable distribution of housing in the Salisbury and Wilton CAs should be considered in combination.

#### **(d) Reviewing growth levels in rural areas.**

- 9.15 One of the issues that emerged through the pre-submission consultation was that the local communities were keen to ensure some growth within the smaller rural settlements. As such, there was significant objection to the wholesale removal of existing settlement boundaries as proposed in the submission draft. The rationale for this was that some modest, proportionate growth would be welcome in order to avoid the stagnation of rural areas.
- 9.16 As discussed at the EiP into the SWCS, there was concern that the proposed removal of permissive housing policies in lower tier settlements within the Core Strategy might in fact have a negative impact on their sustainability. That is, that the historic low levels of infilling that the Local Plan policies have delivered is important to provide local housing opportunities, support local services and support the vitality of settlements. It is important to emphasise that this is not related to the need for housing allocations, but rather an acknowledgement that many smaller settlements have an appetite for modest growth. There is no evidence that these communities wish to see the stagnation of these settlements. These policies have therefore been saved for the time being, as reflected in the revised proposed Core Policy 1 (CP1) put forward by the Council to the Inspector during the formal hearing sessions of the EiP.

- 9.17 It is considered important that the Core Strategy makes provision for new housing in rural areas, thus providing a flexible strategic policy framework. This approach would ensure that communities can grow irrespective of whether this is through neighbourhood plans or community right to build.
- 9.18 While the community have expressed that they would wish to see some development within some of the smaller villages to keep the villages from stagnating, they have emphasised that this should be modest and in keeping with the character of the settlements. In order to identify a reasonable level of housing and given the community views that the levels of growth that have been experienced in the recent past, should continue, it is appropriate to base the number of houses that may be delivered through this source on the historic trends. This identifies average historic delivery of around 55 dwellings per year outside of Salisbury, Wilton and Amesbury on small windfall sites (brownfield sites of under 10 dwellings). Based on this evidence, it is proposed that the Core Strategy be revised to allow for 1100 houses in the plan period, in the rural areas outside of the urban areas of Salisbury, Wilton, Amesbury and the Local Service Centres of Mere, Tisbury and Downton.
- 9.19 It would be wrong to allocate this on a simple pro rata basis, as not all community areas are the same or have the same number of secondary settlements that are capable of accommodating modest growth. Table 3 shows each community area and the secondary settlements within them, as identified within Policy CP1 within the Core Strategy.

*Table 3: Numbers of secondary settlements in each community area:*

<b>Southern Wiltshire</b>	<b>Amesbury</b>	<b>Wilton</b>	<b>Tisbury</b>	<b>Mere</b>	<b>Total</b>
Alderbury	Porton	Broadchalke	Fovant		
Coombe Bissett	Shrewton	Dinton	Hindon		
Morgans Vale /Woodfalls	Tilshead	Great Wishford	Ludwell		
Whiteparish	The Winterbournes				
The Winterslows					
5	4	3	3	0	15

- 9.20 Therefore, the distribution of these homes in each community area is logically made on the basis of the number of secondary settlements each has. This equates to an average of about 73 dwellings per settlement over the lifetime of the plan, or 3 homes per year.
- 9.21 However, there is no assumption that these settlements should accommodate 73 dwellings over the lifetime of the plan, as this is just an indication of the level of housing that each CA could reasonably accommodate. There are also a number of smaller villages that CP1 identifies that may be capable of accommodating some development, and development in these settlements would contribute towards delivery of the figure for the community area. No specific allowance is made for these smaller settlements but it is considered

that any development could be accommodated within the rural allowance of 1,100.

*Table 4: Numbers of secondary settlements in each community area and distribution of numbers:*

Community Area	No of settlements	Multiply by 73 (rounded)
Wilton	3	220
Amesbury	4	295
Southern Wiltshire	5	365
Tisbury	3	220
Mere	0	0
Total	16	1100

9.22 This distribution is a realistic reflection of past windfall trends and a direct reflection of the stated aim of many settlements to have some modest growth to avoid stagnation. Due to its nature at this point it is not possible to be certain over where windfall proposals may come forward. Therefore, while it is valid to make a reasonable allowance of housing to facilitate these aspirations the Core Strategy is a strategic document and it is not appropriate for it to be spatially distributed down to individual settlement level. Rather the SWCS should set a positive, facilitating framework to allow these goals to be delivered. In time, subject to the passage of the Localism Bill, this may include communities pursuing a neighbourhood plan or right to build scheme.

9.23 Making realistic allowance for some growth in the smaller rural settlements would allow some 1100 houses to be delivered in the rural areas. Allowing for this modest growth in rural areas does not undermine the Core Strategies approach to front loaded development being focused around the City, as discussed later in this report.

### **(e) Housing distribution**

9.24 The application of the methodology used to produce the sustainable settlement strategy and the other considerations described above result in the following outcomes for distributing the 9,900 homes.

*Table 5: Comparison between Submission Document and review figures taking account of a rural allowance for neighbourhood plans.*

Community Area	Submission Figure	Revised Figure	Change
Salisbury/Wilton	9050	6060	- 2990(33%)
Amesbury	2650	2395	- 255 (10 %)
South Wiltshire	740	555	- 185 (25%)
Mere	290	250	- 40 (14%)
Tisbury	440	420	- 20 (5 %)
Total	13170	9900	- 3270 (25 %)

9.25 Once the rural allowance has been taken into consideration, 8,800 dwellings should be distributed amongst Salisbury and Wilton, Amesbury and the Local Service Centres as the main settlements in the area identified within Core Policy CP1.

- 9.26 This is based on the consideration of the level of facilities within Salisbury and Wilton, the availability of deliverable land, the environmental constraints, the need to plan sustainably for the long term and the latest housing needs figures, therefore a figure of 6,220 dwellings has been identified for Salisbury and Wilton community areas, which includes 6,000 dwellings for the strategic settlements of Salisbury and Wilton. This is consistent with the level identified within the draft SWRSS of 6,000 dwellings, which was also put forward by the former Wiltshire County Council at the EIP as a reasonable level of provision for 'Salisbury and Wilton' if the draft SWRSS EIP Panel were minded to recommend increased figures.
- 9.27 This equates to over 60% of the housing requirement for the area, which is indicative of the dominance of Salisbury and Wilton, as the main strategic settlement in the area and represents a significant shift from the 4,100 identified within the adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 over a 20 year period.
- 9.28 The four remaining community areas should therefore accommodate about 3680 dwellings in total, of which 880 form part of the rural allowance. However, it is of course possible that this level may in reality be higher should the local communities choose to bring forward new growth through proposed neighbourhood plans and the community right to build if current proposals in the Localism Bill become law.
- 9.29 Part 6 of Topic Paper, Second Addendum explained why the dispersal of housing in the Amesbury community area should be considered separately from that in other rural areas. In summary this is because of its unique characteristics and the functional relationship with the Garrison villages. This Topic Paper concluded that 35% of the growth of Salisbury should be provided in the Amesbury community area to provide for the longstanding strategy at Amesbury of delivering housing growth in conjunction with major business expansion at Solstice Park, (and the continued employers at Boscombe Down, Porton Down and the MOD) to boost the self-containment of the settlement. This rationale still remains sound and is supported by the community. Therefore Amesbury, as the dominant settlement in the community area should accommodate around 2,100 dwellings (around 35% of the dwellings proposed for Salisbury). Together with the rural allowance, this would provide for 2,395 dwellings within the community area as a whole.
- 9.30 This leaves the remaining three community areas to accommodate 1,285 dwellings in total, of which 585 have been distributed to the rural areas outside of the Local Service Centres, as shown in Table 4 above. This means that Downton, Tisbury and Mere should accommodate 700 dwellings. Applying the Sustainable Settlement Strategy criteria from Topic Paper 3 (and addenda) and using the number of basic facilities at each of these settlements as a means to distribute growth indicates that Downton should accommodate 300 dwellings; Mere 200 dwellings and Tisbury 200 dwellings.
- 9.31 However, an analysis of completions that have taken place since 2006 and outstanding commitments shows that this would leave a residual of in excess of 200 dwellings to be found at Downton. Taking into consideration the role and function of Downton this is considered to be an excessive level of development in relation to the character of the settlement and the capacity to accommodate further development within the existing urban form. It is

therefore considered that a level commensurate with the original figure in the draft SWCS should be maintained (190 dwellings). This leaves 110 dwellings to be redistributed.

- 9.32 An analysis of the recent level of completions since 2006 and outstanding commitments for residential development (23 dwellings in total) in the Rest of the Mere community area indicates that some growth should be allowed for, rather than the 0 currently proposed. As such, a modest level of 50 dwellings should be redistributed from Downton to the Rest of Mere community area. The residual 60 dwellings can be accommodated at the Salisbury and Wilton, as the main location for growth in the South Wiltshire area, which represents a marginal increase to the Salisbury and Wilton figure.

### **(g) Employment distribution calculations**

- 9.33 The distribution of employment land within the SWCS was geographically directed by the draft SWRSS, which required Salisbury to ‘enhance its role as an employment and service centre’ (RPP/02, policy HMA11) whilst for the Amesbury area, it identified that ‘there are opportunities for some job growth at locations such as Amesbury’ (Paragraph 4.1.78).
- 9.34 As detailed in Paragraph 5.18 of the SWCS proposed submission draft, the strategy seeks to deliver growth in a sustainable manner, which balances the delivery of new homes with new jobs and service provision. The strategy of the SWCS of working towards self containment remains, with the mixed use sites and the majority of new employment land to be directed towards Salisbury City (albeit a reduced amount, as indicated in Table 7 below) with the sites at Porton Down and Boscombe Down being maintained due to the importance these sites contribute to the local economy. The small employment allocations at Mere and Tisbury should also continue to be saved to meet the employment requirements of these rural communities.

*Table 6 Comparison to Core Strategy Submission Figures – Employment in hectares*

<b>Community Area</b>	<b>Submission Figure</b>	<b>Revised Figure</b>	<b>Change</b>
Salisbury/Wilton	39 ha (33ha new and 6 ha saved)	29 ha (23 ha new and 6 ha saved)	-10 ha
Amesbury	17 ha	17ha	No change
South Wiltshire	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mere	3ha	3ha	No change
Tisbury	1.4ha	1.4ha	No Change
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.4ha</b>	<b>50.4ha</b>	

- 9.33 The Council’s strategy of delivering the redevelopment of the Churchfields Industrial Estate still remains and for this around 28ha of employment land is needed (see paragraph 5.1 of Topic Paper 9 Economy – TOP/09 A) to facilitate a decant of businesses. This results in a total employment land requirement of around 48 ha. Reducing the employment land requirement by 10 hectares would result in around 50ha of employment land being required, meeting the full employment land need to 2026 for both strategic employment and the regeneration of Churchfields Industrial Estate.

## 10. Review of strategic site allocations

- 10.1 The previous sections of this paper have described how the review has confirmed that the underpinning strategy in the SWCS is still the right one and explained how the revised growth figures have been derived for South Wiltshire. The implications for the settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1 have also been addressed, as has the question over why the SWCS as originally conceived should not simply be allowed to roll forward. This part of the paper sets out the implications of these conclusions on the Strategic Site Allocations (SSAs) as set out in Core Policy 2 of the SWCS.
- 10.2 The first part of this paper establishes that the housing requirement for South Wiltshire has been reduced from a minimum of 12,400 to 9,900 and the job requirement has reduced from 13,900 to 10,400. Having established that it is appropriate for the Core Strategy to plan for fewer homes and jobs, this part of the paper therefore examines in detail the current Strategic Site Allocations to establish whether all of the sites are required at this time or if they can be reduced in number without jeopardizing the strategy itself.

### **(a) Explaining the contribution that the strategic allocations make to the revised growth figures**

- 10.3 When considering the revised growth figures, it is important to emphasise that not all of the growth has to be met through allocations in the plan. Firstly those homes that have either been built since the start of the plan period (2006), have been granted planning permission or that will come forward on saved Local Plan allocations can be deducted from the total. These are known as existing 'completions' and 'commitments' and are not an insignificant number, as can be seen in the third column of the table below. Secondly PPS12 is explicit that only those allocations necessary to deliver the heart of the strategy are required. If the numbers of houses are being reduced, then there is a need to review the SSAs made in the SWCS to ensure the Core Strategy still meets this test of soundness.
- 10.4 The table below clearly shows that the strategic allocations proposed in the submitted Core Strategy more than meet the total residual housing requirement (when completions and deliverable commitments have been taken off) for Salisbury/Wilton, and for Amesbury only a residual 160 dwellings will be left to find. Again this raises the question of whether it is appropriate to meet such growth through the level of allocations proposed in the SWCS, when it has been established how the environmentally constrained area of South Wiltshire makes planning sustainably, in accordance with PPS1, challenging and how the local community are concerned about growth levels.

*Table 7: Balance of housing needed compared to South Wiltshire Core Strategy Submission Draft allocations.*

Community Area	Revised Figure	Completions 2006 to 2010	Commitments at 2010	Balance of housing	Allocations in Submission Draft Core Strategy	Balance taking account of reviewed allocations
Salisbury/Wilton <sup>1</sup>	6280	840	1053	4387	4700	-313
Amesbury	2395	674	252	1469	1300	169
Southern Wiltshire	555	90	116	349	0	349
Mere	250	101	40	109	0	109
Tisbury	420	83	122	215	0	215
<b>Total</b>	<b>9900</b>	<b>1788</b>	<b>1583</b>	<b>6529</b>	<b>6000</b>	<b>529</b>

**(c) Justification for reviewing the current levels of growth provided on strategic allocations in Salisbury and Wilton**

- 10.5 Section 7 of this report highlights why it is considered appropriate to review the overall growth numbers for South Wiltshire and many of these factors apply equally when considering the strategic allocations in and around Salisbury and Wilton.
- 10.6 Consultation carried out during the Core Strategy process indicated that there were many parts of the local community that did not support one or more of the strategic allocations proposed in Salisbury and Wilton.
- 10.7 Paragraph 4.6 of PPS12 states that strategic sites “should be those sites considered central to the achievement of the strategy”. There is no local desire or requirement for an over supply and the strategy therefore only seeks to meet the identified levels of housing growth.
- 10.8 By including the strategic allocations within the review of the most up to date evidence, this will allow a more complete picture to be formed of how the strategy can most effectively deliver sustainable growth towards meeting local needs taking into account the environmental constraints of Salisbury/Wilton and the views of the local community.
- 10.9 Work undertaken on the Salisbury Vision since the EiP including feasibility studies indicates that the redevelopment of Churchfields and The Engine Sheds will probably take up to 15 years. This means that the imperative of delivering the decant land in the first years of the plan period will not be so acute. Given that this review has already identified that less housing is needed in the early years of the plan period, and that the strategy is underpinned by the delivery of mixed use development, this is a further contributory factor which supports the conclusion that there is no longer a need to ensure that all strategic sites around Salisbury/Wilton are delivered within the initial plan period (5 years). This provides further justification as to

<sup>1</sup> This includes allocations for Salisbury which are in neighbouring parish of Laverstock which itself is in the Southern Community Area.

why the strategic sites around Salisbury and Wilton as currently allocated in the Core Strategy should be reviewed.

- 10.10 Furthermore, the historic trends of delivery on windfall sites for Salisbury and Wilton indicate that this source of housing supply is likely to continue to contribute housing at a potentially significant level over the remainder of the plan period. While, by its very nature, it is not possible to rely on windfall levels continuing at the same levels, it is sensible to look at trends which indicate that even if delivery dropped to 50% of its current level it could still be significant source of supply. An examination of the delivery of dwellings in the Salisbury and Wilton community areas over the period 2006 to 2010 shows that 456 out of 854 gross dwellings (53%) have been delivered through windfall sites. The potential contribution of SSAs needs to be assessed in relation to the environmental capacity of Salisbury, as set out in Section 7, and for those reasons and given the likely continuation of delivery on windfall sites, it is concluded that it is preferable to reduce the levels of growth (and resultant environmental impact) on greenfield strategic allocations around Salisbury. The Core Strategy should ensure that the ongoing delivery of windfall dwellings is reviewed as the plan progresses as part of a plan, monitor and manage approach.
- 10.11 Therefore, given that there is clear justification for considering the contribution made to the Strategy by the SSAs, the following sections of this paper explain how a fair and objective methodology can be used to determine whether all the SSAs within the Core Strategy should be retained.

### **(c) Justification for NOT changing the strategic allocation in Amesbury**

- 10.12 The Settlement Strategy Topic Paper Second Addendum (TOP 03c, paragraphs 3.15 to 3.20) explains that Amesbury and the Garrison Villages of Durrington and Bulford fulfil a unique role and function within South Wiltshire, which does not conform to other classifications within the settlement hierarchy. Any consideration of growth at Amesbury should therefore be viewed in this context, which has also been supported by a longstanding locally supported policy of balanced growth.
- 10.13 The policy of allowing growth at Amesbury in a balanced manner, which matches new homes at Butterfield Down and Archers Gate with large new employment opportunities at Solstice Park and nearby military bases, has been in place for 20 years. This has led to an evolving role for Amesbury as it becomes more self contained in relation to Salisbury, as well as providing jobs and services to a wider group of satellite settlements. A second phase of residential development at Archers Gate (provisionally called Kings Gate) has long been planned to ensure residential opportunities keep pace with employment growth. This approach continues to be supported by the local community. Paragraph 4.27 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (LPP/01) in supporting policy H9 states 'In order to ensure that future development in Amesbury is undertaken in a sustainable manner, it is important to ensure that the employment development and infrastructure needed to serve the new residential development are taken into account in the timing of the new housing development'.

- 10.14 After taking account of completions and commitments, the current strategic allocation proposed in Amesbury will result in a level of growth that is still consistent with its role and function and supports the communities' aspirations. This will allow for the strategic allocation to come forward and a reasonable level of windfall housing to support smaller more rural communities later in the plan period once existing commitments have been developed.
- 10.15 An examination of the historic delivery of committed dwellings in the Amesbury community area in the period 2006 to 2026 indicates that only 133 out of 674 (19%) have been delivered through brownfield windfall sites, compared to the figure of 53% in the Salisbury and Wilton community areas. Given these trends, retaining the full Kings Gate allocation is seen as the most effective way to ensure the delivery of the minimum amount of housing needed in the Amesbury community area
- 10.16 Therefore, a review of the Kings Gate allocation is not proposed.

#### **(d) Excluding brownfield sites from the review**

- 10.17 The brownfield sites of UKLF, Imerys, Churchfields, Maltings and Central Car park have been discounted from this review. Not only is it directly in accordance with national planning policy to develop brownfield sites first, but there are other reasons for this. The closure of UKLF and Imerys could create areas of decline if their future regeneration is not planned as a priority. This is highlighted in paragraph 3.3(f) of the SWCS. In addition the Salisbury Vision highlights some key challenges facing the city of Salisbury. As detailed in paragraph 3.4c of the SWCS, Churchfields, Salisbury's major industrial estate, is highly constrained by railway bridges and the river, which means it has little room for expansion which is impacting negatively on local business expansion plans. The Salisbury Vision also proposes the redevelopment of the Central Car Park/ Maltings, which is seen as essential to secure the future of Salisbury as a retail centre, as expressed in Core Policy 7 of the SWCS. It is imperative that these regeneration and Vision projects on brownfield sites should continue to be planned for to ensure the future prosperity for Salisbury.

## **11. Methodology for reviewing Strategic Site Allocations**

### **(A) Background**


- 11.1 Section 10 above has clearly set out the justification for reviewing the strategic site allocations and this section sets out the methodology that has been used to do so. In reviewing the strategic site allocations in Salisbury and Wilton it is important to bear in mind that the principle of suitability of development on all of these allocations has already been established otherwise they would not have been allocated in the emerging SWCS in the first place. It is important to emphasise that the Strategic Site Allocations identified within the SWCS submission draft remain deliverable and developable, and that this part of the review is seeking to answer the

question: If the justification for reducing growth levels from strategic sites is accepted, then how could this best be achieved? As less land needs to be allocated to meet the strategic needs of the area, there needs to be a clear methodology for seeing which sites may not be required at this time. It is the case that some sites are easier to develop and may have different constraints, which make them a more sustainable option than others. The starting point for this part of the review is to revisit the original site selection methodology and implement a finer grain analysis to establish if the sites can be reasonably ranked in order of suitability.

11.2 The evidence for selecting the allocations is set out in the Site Selection Paper (Topic Paper 19, paper 2). The following map is an extract from that Topic Paper and illustrates those areas that have potential for future growth, subject to further detailed assessment and analysis. These areas are divided into one of 3 groups:

- those with no scope for strategic growth – areas 4,6 and 15 illustrated in red on the map
- those with only limited scope for strategic growth – areas 1,2,9,10,11 and 16 illustrated in blue on the map
- those with potential for a strategic allocation – areas 3,7,8,12,13 and 14 illustrated in green on the map.

**Map 1: Potential Areas for Strategic Growth in and around Salisbury/Wilton**



11.3 Most of the green areas that have been identified as having potential for strategic growth are where the strategic allocations have been proposed in the Core Strategy. The process of identifying these areas is based on a constraints mapping exercise - for example, this sifted out all those areas subject to heritage constraints, flood risk constraints, nature conservation constraints, AONB and national park, military land. The Landscape

Character Assessment, prepared on behalf of the Council by Chris Blandford Associates, has then been used to assess the remaining areas in more detail. This assessment considered issues such as topography, visual assessment, townscape and landscape role and function, and any special qualities to be safeguarded in the area.

11.4 This review does not, and cannot change, this existing evidence in the Site Selection Paper. This review will not, therefore, change the appropriateness of these sites and hence all the green sites on the map above still have potential for strategic growth. What this review will examine is which, out of the greenfield SSAs, are the most suitable and should come forward first should some of those sites identified in the SWCS not be required as early as originally envisaged. This does not mean that the sites that are ranked as less suitable sites aren't still appropriate, developable and deliverable, and won't come forward at some stage in the future.

11.5 Therefore the sites assessed through this stage of the Review are:

- Fugglestone Red
- Hampton Park
- Longhedge (Old Sarum)
- South of Netherhampton Road

### **(B) Adopting a criterion based approach**

11.6 A systematic and objective approach has been taken to reassess the strategic allocations and this has been based on a review of a number of key criteria that were used to identify their suitability for development in the first instance. These criteria are as follows:

- sustainability
- landscape appraisal
- heritage
- transport
- water / flooding
- biodiversity / wildlife
- place making
- consultation feedback

11.7 Each site is assessed against each of these criteria, using the following scoring/traffic light matrix:

<b>1 – Least suitable</b>
<b>2 – Less suitable</b>
<b>3 – Suitable</b>
<b>4 – Most suitable</b>

11.8 Those sites scoring the highest points are considered to be the most suitable and conversely those scoring the lowest points, the least suitable. A completed pro-forma assessing each site is included in Appendix 1. As discussed earlier in the review some sites have already been discounted from being reviewed namely, UKLF, Imerys, Maltings and Central Car Park and the redevelopment of Churchfields. The following explains in more detail each of the criteria that has been used to assess the sites.

#### **(i) Sustainability**

- 11.9 A further assessment of the sustainability of each site is carried out with reference to the Sustainability Appraisal Report July 2009 (SWCS/03).
- 11.10 All the strategic allocations were found to be sustainable otherwise they would not have been allocated in the first place. However, some are likely to be more sustainable than others. The Sustainability Appraisal Report (SWCS/03) assesses the sites against 23 different sustainability objectives, using different categories of assessment.
- 11.11 The sustainability objectives are:

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</b>	
1	To promote social inclusion of all, ensuring a fully inclusive environment, and addressing the needs of the young and old, those with disabilities, and diverse groups.
2	To ensure that everybody has the opportunity of living in a decent and affordable home
3	To improve health and well being of the population
4	To improve community safety and reduce crime, including perceptions of the fear of crime.
5	To improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities
6	To improve the availability and accessibility to open space, including accessible natural green space, within and around communities.
7	To increase energy efficiency including that of buildings, and promote the generation of energy from renewable sources
8	To reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling
9	To improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions
10	To promote sustainable transport choices by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas
11	To make efficient use of land and, where appropriate. Maximise the use of previously developed sites.
12	To respond to threats proposed by flooding and promote water in the interests of water resources.
13	To improve road safety and reduce congestion on roads
14	To maintain and improve the quality and quantity of the district's rivers including those protected under the Special Area of Conservation.
15	To conserve and enhance the district's biodiversity and geodiversity, including downland habitats and those protected under Special Protection Areas.
16	To conserve and enhance the District's landscapes
17	To facilitate sustainable economic growth, development and competitiveness of new and existing businesses
18	To provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth and encourage investment in the district.
19	To raise educational attainment and improve workforce skills
20	To harness the economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities
21	To maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of new and existing services and facilities and re-emphasise the 'town centre first' objective in respect to retail development.
22	To promote development of highest standard that responds to its setting and is appropriate to its function.
23	To protect, maintain and improve the recognised built heritage and cultural assets of the district, including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

- 11.12 The different categories of assessment used are as follows:

++	Strong and significant beneficial impact
+	Potential beneficial impact
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine base the assessment at this stage
	1. Development has no impact; or 2. Effect is neutral
-	Development appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts but mitigation possible
--	Potentially significant adverse impact / mitigation less likely
x	Strong and significant adverse impact

- 11.13 The sustainability objectives were used along with a series of decision aiding questions detailed in table 4.1 of SWCS/03 to come out with an assessment score.
- 11.14 It should be noted that, whilst there are 23 sustainability objectives, for the Fugglestone Red, Longhedge and Netherhampton Road sites, one of the objectives was given two scorings, hence the total number of objectives for each of these sites is 24. The reason for this is that in the case of some Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives, the development of a site could have both positive and negative impacts. For example, Sustainability Objective 10 is to, 'To promote sustainable transport choices by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas. Taking the Fugglestone Red site as an example, for this objective, this site was given two scorings. Firstly, the SA report concluded that this site has potential to encourage walking or cycling, is near to a park and ride bus service so has more potential for use and is also a catalyst to improve bus service. The SA report therefore concluded that for this reason the development of this site will have a potentially beneficial impact. However, the SA report also concludes that there are congestion issues associated with this site and that there is potential for further adverse impact on air quality in this area. There are also potential air pollution issues on Devizes Road. The SA therefore assesses this as having a potentially significant adverse impact /mitigation less likely.
- 11.15 For the Longhedge site, the SA report gives two scores against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 16, which is to "conserve and enhance the district's landscape". The SA concludes that development of this site has the potential for adverse effects on the landscape due to Old Sarum Castle but that land to the north west of the Roman Road which bisects the site would have less impact. The SA therefore gives this site two scores – firstly, a negative score because the development appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts. Secondly, a positive score, because mitigation may be possible.
- 11.16 For the site on Netherhampton Road, the SA report gives two scores against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 1 which is "to improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities". For this site, the SA comments that there are basic community facilities accessible in Harnham and good, well used walking and cycle routes into Salisbury for a wider range of facilities. The SA therefore gives the site a score of "potential beneficial impact" against this objective. However, the SA also concludes that the western side of the site is remote from facilities (over 2km) and raises issues over access, and

therefore gives this site another score against this objective which reads “development appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts”.

- 11.17 By examining the Sustainability Appraisal objectives findings for each site, and specifically looking at the different categories of assessment used, it should be possible to determine which of the strategic allocations are more sustainable and which are less sustainable.
- 11.18 The Sustainability Appraisal uses symbols to score each SA objective against each site. However, in order to judge which of the sites are more sustainable than others, the table below counts for each site how many of the sustainability objectives are scored in the Sustainability Appraisal as having a strong and beneficial impact, how many have potential beneficial impact through to how many have strong and significant adverse impact. For example, for the Fugglestone Red site, three of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives were assessed as having a “strong an significant beneficial impact”, thirteen of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives were assessed as having a “potential beneficial impact”, two of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives were assessed as having “uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine based the assessment”, and so on.
- 11.19 The full appraisals can be found in appendix v of the final Sustainability Report July 2009

*Table 8: Strategic Allocations Scores for Sustainability Appraisal Objectives*

	<b>Fugglestone Red</b>	<b>Hampton Park</b>	<b>Longhedge</b>	<b>Harnham</b>
Strong and significant beneficial impact	3	1	1	1
Potential beneficial impact	13	8	13	8
Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine base the assessment at this stage	2	6	1	4
1. Development has no impact; or 2. Effect is neutral	0	2	3	4
Development appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts but mitigation possible	3	5	6	6
Potentially significant adverse impact / mitigation less likely	3	1	0	1
Strong and significant adverse impact – absolute constraints to development	0	0	0	0
	24	23	24	24

***(a) Assessing beneficial Impact on sustainability***

11.20 Adding the number of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives for each site that have a “strong or significant beneficial impact” or “or potential beneficial impact” as a percentage of all the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives indicates which sites have the most beneficial impact. The results of these calculations are as follows (in order of sites with most beneficial impacts):

- Fugglestone Red  
16 of the SA objectives were scored as having a beneficial impact, equating to 67%.
- Longhedge  
14 of the SA objectives were scored as having a beneficial impact, equating to 58%
- Hampton Park  
9 of the SA objectives were scored as having a beneficial impact, equating to 39%
- Netherhampton Road  
9 of the SA objectives were scored as having a beneficial impact, equating to 37.5%

**(b) Assessing negative impacts on sustainability**

11.21 None of the sites had a “strong and significant adverse impact” on sustainability. Adding the number of Sustainability Appraisal objectives for each site where “development appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts but mitigation possible” and where there is a “potentially significant adverse impact /mitigation less likely” indicates which sites have the most negative impact. The results of these calculations are as follows (in order of sites with least negative impact):

- Fugglestone Red  
6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 25%.
- Longhedge  
6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 25%
- Hampton Park  
6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 26%
- Netherhampton Road  
7 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 29%

**Conclusions**

11.22 Using the assessment criteria described in paragraph B above this results in the following sustainability score (both positive and negative) for each of the 4 sites being assessed:

*Table 9: Scoring results for assessment against SA criteria*

	Positive Impact Score	Negative Impact Score
Fugglestone Red	3	3
Land South of Netherhampton Road	1	1
Longhedge	2	3
Hampton Park	1	2

11.23 This identifies that Fugglestone Red is the most sustainable site (i.e. most suitable), followed by Longhedge, Hampton Park and lastly Land South of Netherhampton Road.

### **(ii) Landscape appraisal**

11.24 An assessment of the landscape of each site is carried out with reference to the district wide Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (STU/20) and the Settlement Settings Assessment (STU/21) undertaken as part of the LCA. While this formed a key consideration in the initial identification of the greenfield strategic sites in the SWCS, there has been no attempt to use this criteria to see if any of the strategic sites are more preferable in landscape terms than others. In terms of impact on landscape, all development will have some impact, but by re-assessing the LCA it is possible to judge which of the sites are likely to have a greater impact on the landscape than others.

11.25 The Settlement Settings Assessment is based on a number of criteria, including a visual assessment. This looks at key elevated and low level views to Salisbury and Wilton, key Salisbury and Wilton landmarks, distinctive/memorable features in the setting of Salisbury and Wilton and ridgelines. This visual assessment also examines the townscape/countryside interface of the landscape, which considers the elevation, foreground character and built edge character as seen in immediate views from the settlement setting.

11.26 The Settlement Settings Assessment also includes a townscape and landscape analysis, which looks at the first views of Salisbury and Wilton, urban gateways, gateways distinctive to Wilton and Salisbury, the character of approaches to settlements and selected features on approaches such as green finger, necklace villages and open countryside separating necklace villages and these villages with Salisbury and Wilton.

11.27 Townscape and landscape role and function is another criteria used in the Settlement Settings Assessment. This characterises the landscape/townscape as having one of the following roles/functions:

- visually cohesive historic core
- distinctive townscape / landscape
- supportive townscape / landscape
- connective townscape / landscape
- weak townscape / landscape
- outer rural areas

11.28 Special qualities to be safeguarded include features such as green fingers/corridors, peripheral areas with particular qualities and landscape that is not distinctive or supportive.

11.29 Taking account of these criteria, each site has been scored using the “traffic light” system as referred to below. Those sites scoring the highest points are considered to be the most suitable and conversely those scoring the lowest points, the least suitable.

<b>1 – Least suitable</b>
<b>2 – Less suitable</b>
<b>3 – Suitable</b>
<b>4 – Most suitable</b>

11.30 This results in the 4 sites being assessed as receiving the following scores in landscape terms.

*Table 10: Scoring results for assessment against landscape criteria*

Fugglestone Red	3
Land South of Netherhampton Road	2
Longhedge	3
Hampton Park	3

**(iii) Heritage**

11.31 An assessment of the Heritage assets of each site is carried out with reference to the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (SHEA) (STU 23). This SHEA considers the impact of the proposed strategic allocations on:

- prehistoric landscape, known and unknown archaeology in general
- setting of individual monuments
- setting, key views in and out of Longford (grade II\*) and Wilton (grade I\*) designed landscapes (and also including Amesbury Abbey – grade II\*)
- the setting of Salisbury and key views in and out of Salisbury
- historic farmsteads

11.32 Each proposed development site has been classified as being generally of high, moderate, low, or minimal risk to the historic environment if developed, as follows:

<b>High Risk</b>	<b>Moderate Risk</b>	<b>Low Risk</b>	<b>Minimal risk</b>
There is a severe problem relating to the criterion, and no mitigation measures can alleviate it to any great degree	There is a problem relating to the criterion but this may be lessened if certain mitigation measure are adopted	There is a slight problem relating to the criterion and in some cases this may be lessened if certain mitigation measures are adopted	The criterion is not adversely affected. Therefore no mitigation measures are required.

11.33 This scoring of the potential effect on the historic environment has been assessed against two sets of criteria. The first set of criteria is concerned with known archaeology, site and monuments as follows:

- effects on the known archaeology of the site and the surrounding historic landscape

- effects on the setting, context and key views to or from individual sites and monuments
- effects on the setting, and key views in and out of the designed landscape that could be affected by the development sites
- effects on the setting and key views in and out of the settlements of Salisbury, Wilton and Amesbury
- effects on the setting of historic farmsteads

11.34 These potential impacts on the known aspects of the historic environment take account of both direct impacts (caused by the development) and indirect impacts (such as lighting and increased traffic movements and their effects on the aesthetics and tranquillity of the setting). These are detailed in Appendix 1 of the SHEA and summarised in Table 4.1 of the SHEA, which also provides an overall risk score for each proposed development site, taking full account of all the scores against each of the above criterion. Where appropriate, Table 4.1 of the SHEA summarises potential mitigation measures - reference must be made to Appendix 1 of the SHEA for further details. These have also been summarised in Appendix 1 to this review document.

11.35 The second criterion relates to unknown archaeology and the potential for a site to contain unrecorded archaeological remains. This risk is shown in Table 4.2 and on Map 4.2 of the SHEA. A summary of all these risks is provided in the following table:

*Table 11: Summary of the risk to the historic environment overall, and the risk to potential archaeology of each proposed development site*

	<b>Known Heritage summary</b>	<b>Potential heritage</b>
Fugglestone Red	Moderate risk	Moderate risk
Hampton Park	High Risk	High Risk
Old Sarum (Longhedge)	High Risk	High Risk
South of Netherhampton Road, Harnham	Low Risk	High risk

11.36 It should be noted that the areas of land assessed in the SHEA do not always exactly match the extent of the proposed strategic allocations within the Core Strategy. Where this has a bearing on the comments made about a particular site in the SHEA (e.g. the Hampton Park site), then the site has been re-scored differently to that in the SHEA. For example, for the Hampton Park allocation the SHEA identifies risk of incursion into the setting of the Old Sarum Scheduled Ancient Monument, through potential development of the eastern portion of the strategic area of growth. This has been reassessed against the proposed mitigation contained in the allocation (i.e. a 51ha country park), which effectively neutralises both short and long term threat of development on this important green lung.

11.37 In conclusion the impact on heritage, as assessed in Appendix 1 of this review can be summarised as:

*Table 12: Scoring results for assessment against heritage criteria*

	Known Heritage	Potential Heritage
Fugglestone Red	2	2
Netherhampton Road	3	1
Longhedge	1	1
Hampton Park	3	1

11.38 This shows that in heritage terms, Land south of Netherhampton Road and Longhedge score poorly with Hampton Park scoring the best.

#### **(iv) Transport**

11.39 Updated Transport evidence has now been provided within STU/52 the Wiltshire Strategic Transport Assessment. This has been prepared by Wiltshire Council to inform the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy, as well as this review.

11.40 The study uses software (paragraph 3.2.1) to identify accessibility to areas of search around settlements, including accession mapping and the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS). This looks at key transport indicators such as access to essential services and facilities; public transport service provision; highway network capacity; journey to work patterns and ranks area from the most accessible to the least accessible. Further detail of this can be found in section 5 of the Strategic Transport Assessment.

11.41 The study as a whole looked at 162 areas of search/ sites across the whole of Wiltshire and, although not site specific, it is possible to generally identify the four sites within this review. Appendix 4 of STU/52 provides an overall summary of results.

11.42 However it should be noted that this assessment looks at current accessibility and the existing highway network and does not look at any improvements that could be made as a result of land being allocated for development.

11.43 In conclusion the sites subject to this part of the review have the following scores:

*Table 13: Scoring results for assessment against transport criteria*

Fugglestone Red	2
Land South of Netherhampton Road	3
Longhedge	2
Hampton Park	3

#### **(v) Consultation feedback**

11.44 Overall, all the more general consultation responses point to the fact that local communities within South Wiltshire broadly felt that the level of growth proposed in the draft SWRSS for the area was too high for the environment to accommodate.

11.45 More detailed site specific responses were provided especially with respect to Core Policy 2 and the results of this area of consultation are discussed in Appendix 1 under the site specific table. In summary this identifies the following score for each site assessed.

11.46 Each site is assessed within the matrix in Appendix 1 against each of these criteria described earlier in this paper and can be summarised as follows:

*Table 14: Scoring results for assessment against consultation criteria*

Fugglestone Red	3 - Suitable
Land south of Netherhampton Road	1 – Least Suitable
Hampton Park	3 - Suitable
Longhedge	1 – Least Suitable

11.47 The proposed abolition of the draft SWRSS and the derivation of locally justified growth levels can therefore respond to some of the objections that have been raised by local communities to the proposed level of growth within the SWRSS. In the letter from the Chief Planning Officer to Local Planning Authorities dated 6 July 2010 regarding the revocation of draft SWRSS, it is made clear that Local Planning Authorities should continue to develop LDF core strategies “*reflecting local people’s aspirations and decisions on important issues such as climate change, housing and economic development*”.

**(vi) Water / flooding**

11.48 An assessment of what floodzone the site falls within and also the water / drainage infrastructure that will be required to facilitate the development is made with reference to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (ref) (STU 29 A) and the development Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure section 4, which were informed by discussions with Wessex Water.

11.49 As with other criteria, the same scoring system has been employed to rank the sites according to how they perform under the SFRA and water infrastructure. This is shown at Appendix 1 and can be summarised as:

*Table 15: Scoring results for assessment against water/flooding criteria*

Fugglestone Red	3
Land south of Netherhampton Road	2
Hampton Park	2
Longhedge	2

**(vii) Biodiversity / wildlife**

11.50 An assessment of biodiversity/wildlife issues for each site has been made with reference to the development templates in the SWCS, which themselves were informed by discussions with Natural England and or the County Ecologist. This is ranked in Appendix 1, but is not conclusive as all sites rank as the same.

*Table 16: Scoring results for assessment against biodiversity/wildlife criteria*

Fugglestone Red	3
-----------------	---

Land south of Netherhampton Road	3
Hampton Park	3
Longhedge	3

### (viii) Place-shaping

- 11.51 The evidence clearly supports the need for the Core Strategy to address 'Place Shaping', through ensuring that growth is managed in a way that produces attractive, prosperous, vibrant, safe and strong communities where people want to live, work and do business (see Topic Paper 14, 'Design' and its addenda). Therefore when considering the review of sites, while it was implicit that each site being reviewed could deliver high quality outcomes (or they would not have been included in the first place), it was considered appropriate to reappraise the opportunities each site presented to see if any sites were better placed to deliver than others. Key considerations when comparing the merits of these sites are whether the site is fairly self-contained or whether the development will deliver a range of community benefits to the wider community. How the site integrates into the townscape of the existing built-up area was also considered.

*Table 17: Scoring results for assessment against place shaping criteria*

Fugglestone Red	4
Land south of Netherhampton Road	2
Hampton Park	3
Longhedge	3

## 12. Consideration of the results of the review of strategic site allocations

- 12.1 The detailed, individual appraisals of each strategic site allocation can be found in Appendix 1. In summary, the results are as follows, in order of the most suitable site first:

*Table 18: Results of appraisals for Greenfield Strategic Site Allocations, Salisbury*

Site	Score
Fugglestone Red	28
Hampton Park	24
Longhedge	21
Netherhampton Road	19

- 12.2 The results indicate a distinction between the most suitable sites at the top and the least suitable sites at the bottom.

### (a) Netherhampton Road

- 12.3 Table 8 above indicates that fewer dwellings are required than are currently allocated in the SWCS in Salisbury and Wilton. As the Netherhampton Road site has been rated as the least suitable, it is reasonable to suggest that the site (which is allocated for 400 houses and 10 ha of employment land and counts towards Salisbury's figures) is no longer required as an SSA to meet housing requirements in the SWCS.

12.4 In terms of the employment land allocated on the Netherhampton Road site, one of the principal strands of the employment strategy of the SWCS is the regeneration of Churchfields and the decant sites that are required to facilitate this. There is an existing business park at Harnham, which has yet to be taken up and which, if the 10 ha employment allocation at Netherhampton Road were to be deleted, would still provide the choice for Churchfields businesses to decant to the Harnham area if they so wished.

12.5 Out of all the proposed strategic site allocations in the current Core Strategy, Harnham is the one that is the most divorced from existing communities, being located in the rural valley away from existing residential development in a manner that does not make as good urban design sense as the other sites identified.

**(b) Longhedge**

12.6 This review indicates that the second least suitable site for allocation is Longhedge. With regards to this site, in evidence submitted to the EIP (paragraph 5.8 of HS/1868/3), English Heritage suggested that the following 'flexible' allocation at Longhedge would be considered acceptable:

*'Mixed use development of approximately 17ha/33% to 20ha/40% of the site to enable approximately 8ha of employment development and between 360 and 800 new homes, the precise figure to be determined following a thorough and detailed site assessment and masterplanning process'*

12.7 Whilst it is not accepted that Core Policy allocations can be expressed in such flexible terms, because of the findings of the review of Strategic Allocations it is acknowledged that the area of this site could be reduced as suggested, without having a detrimental impact on the Strategy.

12.8 Developing 20 hectares of the site, with 8 hectares for employment, would allow a housing allocation of 450 houses at approximately 35 dwellings per hectare.

12.9 Deleting or reducing the employment allocation at Longhedge, on the other hand, could have implications for the strategy in that it would jeopardise the relocation of employment uses from Churchfields and the need to identify decant sites to allow this to happen.

12.10 The principle of strategic growth in this area was established under the current Local Plan with the Old Sarum mixed used housing and employment allocation (subsequently granted planning permission) and the Local Plan recognises that there is potential for further growth beyond the current plan period. The Longhedge site is therefore important to consolidate and build critical mass at the existing community.

**(c) Hampton Park**

12.11 The results also indicate that Hampton Park is a more suitable site than Longhedge or Harnham. Indeed out of the Greenfield SSAs proposed around Salisbury it is the second best site, behind Fugglestone Red. There are concerns that meant the site ranked lower than Fugglestone Red, principally because of sustainability and heritage concerns. This site is currently the subject of a planning application by Barrett Homes for 500 homes, country

park and new primary school. The proposal broadly accords in principle with the SWCS submission draft, and is now subject of an appeal for non-determination. At the time of writing this review the Local Planning Authority has yet to consider this application at committee.

12.12 Consultation responses, both to the ongoing SWCS process and in particular the planning application, are generally opposed to the principle of the development of this site on the grounds that Laverstock is not considered to be part of Salisbury and therefore does not need the houses proposed. Comments on the application also suggest that should the development go ahead against the wishes of the community then it should deliver the following:

- Larger Strategic gap at Ford
- Numbers limited to a range of 200- 300
- High quality layout and design (better than submitted in the application)
- Public access to the green infrastructure
- Social infrastructure for both new and existing residents as well as the school
- Flexibility over the future use of the 'country park' including possibility of a community farm.

12.13 These comments were made after the submission of the SWCS to the Secretary of State and it reasonable that they should be given consideration.

12.14 While the representations received are clear and are important considerations, this review has confirmed that in planning terms the site is one of the most appropriate to accommodate the new growth needed by Salisbury. To remove this site, without any credible evidence to support why, would undermine the fundamental soundness of the SWCS. The review has not identified any evidence which supports the removal or a reduction in numbers at this site.

12.15 While the site is within the Parish of Laverstock the site is distant from the village itself and directly abuts the city of Salisbury. It was well rehearsed at the EIP that Salisbury lacks sites within its existing urban area to meet levels of growth required and hence greenfields on the periphery need to be explored. This site forms an urban extension to the City. The development of this site with the retention of a strategic gap and country park will mean that no further development should take place on this edge of Salisbury.

12.16 Consideration of reducing the numbers of dwelling proposed on the SSA to meet the community's wishes has been studied in detail. However, reducing the allocation by 200 dwellings or more would undermine the viability of the site and would mean that the country park, school and the associated place-shaping attributes that the site could bring to the area would be lost. Furthermore there are no sound planning reasons to reduce this number other than the local views. However, minor changes to the SWCS are proposed in order to address the concerns raised by the local community to ensure that the site comes forward in a way that best reflects their views.

12.17 In response to the further assessment of this site and the weight of public opinion it is therefore proposed that the allocation be retained as included in the SWCS but that some of the measures identified by the community are

added to the development template so that mitigation and community benefit is optimised. These minor changes are:

- The layout of any development shall be revised to increase the width of the strategic gap from that shown on the Development Template in Appendix A of the SWCS submission document, between the development and Ford;
- Added flexibility over the future function of the green open space to allow the community to agree its best use; and
- A community forum is established to help steer the development for the site and ensure that outcomes meet local aspirations.

**(d) Fugglestone Red**

- 12.18 This SSA is to remain unchanged. The site came out as the most sustainable and best of the greenfield allocations through the objective review. It provides a good opportunity to bring some much needed community facilities to the North West of Salisbury, which is lacking and in townscape/landscape terms remains a logical urban extension to Salisbury.

## 13. The balance of housing needed as a result of the review and implications for 5 year land supply

13.1 Given the proposed changes to the SSAs the following table summarises how the SWCS will deliver growth over the course of the plan period.

*Table 19: Balance of housing needed compared to revised Core Strategy Allocations*

Community Area	Figures in submitted SWCS	Revised figure (a)	Completions (b)	Commitments (c)	Balance of housing growth (d) (a-b-c=d)	Reviewed allocations in Core Strategy (e)	Balance taking account of reviewed allocations (f) (d-e=f)
<a href="#">Salisbury/Wilton</a> <sup>2</sup>	8,100 <sup>3</sup>	6,060	727	1010	4,323	3950	373
Rest of Wilton Community Area	950	220	113	43	64	0	64
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>9,050</b>	<b>6,280</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>1,053</b>	<b>4,387</b>	<b>3,950</b>	<b>437</b>
Amesbury	1,960	2100	564	76	1,460	1300	160
Rest of Amesbury Community Area	690	295	110	176	9	0	9
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>2,650</b>	<b>2,395</b>	<b>674</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>1,469</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>169</b>
Downton	190	190	16	42	132	0	132
Rest of Southern Community Area	550	365	74	74	217	0	217
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>555</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>349</b>
Mere	270	200	82	36	82	0	82
Rest of Mere Community Area	20	50	19	4	27	0	27
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>109</b>
Tisbury	160	200	54	101	45	0	45
Rest of Tisbury Community Area	280	220	29	21	170	0	170
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,170</b>	<b>9,900</b>	<b>1788</b>	<b>1583</b>	<b>6,529</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>1,279</b>

<sup>2</sup> This includes allocations for Salisbury which are in neighbouring parish of Laverstock which itself is in the Southern Community Area.

<sup>3</sup> In the submitted SWCS, Core Policy 1, Salisbury was allocated 7480 dwellings and Wilton 620.

- 13.2 One reason (but not the only one) that the allocations are 'strategic' is the contribution they make to the Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 requirement of maintaining continuous 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. It is important, whatever the outcome of the review of the SWCS, that this 5 year supply is still maintained.
- 13.3 The reviewed strategic allocations in the plan at Salisbury, Wilton and Amesbury (5250 dwellings in total) represent around 10 years of land supply. Furthermore, these calculations do not include saved Local Plan allocations and commitments.

## 14. Implications for contingency

- 14.1 Paragraph 62 of PPS3 advises that "reflecting the principles of Plan, Monitor, Manage", Local Development Documents should set out a housing implementation strategy that describes the approach to managing delivery of the housing and previously-developed land targets and trajectories. This should include scenario and contingency planning to identify different delivery options, in the event that actual housing delivery does not occur at the rate expected.
- 14.2 If the delivery of housing does not take place at the rate expected, for example if one of the retained allocations does not come forward, there is potential contingency via the areas indicated on the Site Selection Map (Map 1 on page 28). This would include the Netherhampton Road (400 dwellings), the remainder of the Longhedge site (350 dwellings) or the area of search at Salisbury Hospital referred to in the SWCS (1132 dwellings). These sites represent strategic reserves. In addition to these, the Salisbury Vision sites not allocated in the SWCS because of short-term uncertainty about delivery could offer further potential contingency, particularly in the Southampton Road area.

## 15. Conclusions of this review

- 15.1 The Government's intention to abolish the draft SWRSS and the localism agenda has meant that a review of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Submission Draft is necessary. This is particularly so given that the housing and job growth numbers in the draft SWRSS are unlikely to form part of the adopted development plan relating to Wiltshire. A review has therefore been undertaken using up to date evidence to justify how the housing and job numbers need to be revised. PPS12 requires consistency with national policy in order for a strategy to be sound. Clearly with the many changes introduced by the change of Government that occurred after the initial SWCS EIP and in light of new evidence, it is prudent to review the document.

- 15.2 The review has been conducted, taking account of a number of factors, which have been assessed in order to determine if changes are required to the SWCS to ensure it represents the most appropriate way in which to manage the strategic growth in South Wiltshire.
- 15.3 As has been consistently argued by the Council, South Wiltshire is a highly constrained environment and finding developable land to meet local housing and employment needs requires a considered response. There are a number of factors which explain why it is appropriate to reduce the numbers from those in the draft SWRSS and SWCS submission document, as follows:
- Ensuring prudent use of the constrained environmental capacity in South Wiltshire;
  - Ensuring the Core Strategy plans in a sustainable manner for future homes and jobs, in accordance with PPS1;
  - Recent improvements in housing delivery rates has eased the pressure for so much immediate growth;
  - Intention to abolish the requirement to plan for “minimum” levels of housing within the draft SWRSS;
  - Greater recognition of Salisbury’s dominance in a predominantly rural area in the distribution of growth;
  - Contribution that windfall delivery of housing supply makes to supply;
  - Impact on Water Supply Infrastructure;
  - Ensuring that some growth in the rural settlements can take place;
  - Consideration of the localism agenda.
- 15.4 In light of these factors, we have concluded that the approach detailed in this document which seeks to balance the need to provide for appropriate levels of growth, including affordable housing delivery, in a manner that reflects the spatial characteristics of the area and the concerns of its local communities is justified. This approach is wholly consistent with achieving the correct balance.
- 15.5 Taking all of the factors identified into account it is the logical conclusion that the opportunity should be taken to reduce the levels of growth in South Wiltshire, rather than to continue with those within the submission draft which were challenging to the environmental capacity of the area.
- 15.6 With the rationale of the justification for a review established, an objective appraisal of the SWCS was conducted, based on a review of extant and new evidence. The review has confirmed that fundamentally the strategy is the right one and should be retained, but with some focussed changes principally to Core Policies 1 and 2, to reflect the revision downwards in the growth levels required and the consequent changes to the Strategic Site Allocations. The key finding of the review can be summarised as follows:
- The latest evidence indicates that the level of housing growth set out in the draft SWRSS is too high and that the SWCS should be planning for growth of 9,900 homes, not 12,400 within the draft SWRSS;
  - The SWCS should be planning for 10,400 jobs, not the 13,900 within the draft SWRSS;

- There is still the need to provide for growth and the strategy of frontloading the delivery of strategic sites early in the plan period is still appropriate.
- Although lower growth figures are proposed, these are still ambitious when compared to historic delivery rates.
- While the projected need for affordable housing and economy driven growth remains much higher than the environmental capacity of South Wiltshire, an appropriate balance has been made towards meeting these needs.
- The focus of growth at Salisbury/Wilton and Amesbury as the most sustainable places for development is correct.
- There is a need to ensure provision for modest growth in the smaller rural communities to support their vitality.
- Not all of the growth proposed to be delivered through the Strategic Site Allocations (SSA) is justified given the lower levels of growth.
- A systematic appraisal of the SSAs has identified land that should not be brought forward at this time but instead be identified as a strategic reserve with development potential in the longer term.

15.7 In order to deliver these findings a number of changes are proposed to the SWCS submission document, and these are set out as revisions to the document that partner this report. In summary the key changes proposed to the Core Strategy are as follows:

#### **Summary of Key Changes proposed to the SWCS as result of the review**

- The target for housing growth to be revised down to 9,900
- The target for jobs growth to be revised down to 10,400
- A growth figure of 6020 dwellings will be delivered in Salisbury/Wilton and some 220 in the rest of Wilton Community Area
- 2395 dwellings in Amesbury Community Area
- Strategic site allocations will deliver 3950 dwellings at Salisbury/Wilton
- The Strategic Site Allocation at Netherhampton Road is not required at this time and will be deleted
- The Strategic Site Allocation at Longhedge will be retained but reduced to deliver 450 homes (employment to remain unchanged)
- The Strategic Site Allocation at Hampton Park will be retained, but in recognition of strong local representations the development template will be revised to; place greater emphasis on the strategic gap with Ford; provide further flexibility over the future function of the green open space; to provide a community forum to guide development
- Land at Netherhampton Road and Longhedge will be added to the long term reserve for the Strategy as future areas of search.

15.8 These changes are focussed on Core Policies 1 and 2 in the SWCS. In accordance with the Planning Advisory Service Guidance on making changes to the Core Strategy, these represent focussed changes which alter a narrow (albeit important) part of the plan, but do not alter the fundamental strategy or constitute a significant change in direction. There will be a number of small changes required throughout the document as a result of these focussed

changes. They are confined to consequential changes necessary to ensure the document is consistent. All changes proposed to the SWCS as a result of this review are shown in full on the Council website in a document entitled: *'Schedule of Changes to South Wiltshire Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Document) As A Result Of the Review 2011'*. A summary is included in Appendix 2 of this document.

- 15.9 The evidence, as collated in the set of themed topic papers accompanying the SWCS, has been revisited in conjunction with the outcome of the review and shows that the pressures on South Wiltshire have not substantially changed. There is still the pressure for homes owing to an ageing population that must be planned for, young families and first time buyers finding it difficult to get on the housing ladder. There is still the need to plan for economic growth by providing the location choices for business that help support an attractive investment environment and to support the Salisbury Vision through providing new employment (decant) sites. The latest retail evidence still indicates that Salisbury needs a significant boost in its retail offer to reverse decline in the face of increased sub-regional competition. Regeneration of the UKLF is paramount for future prosperity of Salisbury and Wilton, as is maintaining the strategy of balanced growth in Amesbury. It is clear that the villages should support modest, high quality, growth commensurate with their roles and functions.
- 15.10 The changes proposed will still deliver an ambitious strategy which maintains the approach which underpins the SWCS, achieved through the encouragement of the early delivery of sites, (known as the 'frontloading' of the strategy), to make early progress in meeting the challenges faced in South Wiltshire. With the focussed changes proposed, it will now do so in a manner that is more appropriate to the levels of growth required, based on up to date evidence and in a manner that is more reflective of views of the local communities.



## Appendix 1 – Appraisal of Strategic Site Allocations

Fugglestone Red		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Sustainability	<p>Section 11 of this report identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 of the SA objectives were scored as having a beneficial impact, equating to 67%.</li> <li>• 6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 25%.</li> </ul> <p><b>SA summary</b> Page 55 of Appendix V of the Sustainability Appraisal SWCS/03 of Area of Search SA – Salisbury Area 3.</p> <p>The area of search has a better relationship to Wilton than sites 1 and 2 as well as Salisbury City, and offers the potential for improvement of access to facilities for the existing somewhat isolated housing estate. Further benefits include the use of some previously developed land, the redevelopment of a secondary school and the opportunity for higher density development and the creation of new habitat through the restoration of the quarry area. Issues surrounding drainage and water abstraction and the potential for adverse impact on the approach to Wilton House are also identified. Careful design and layout would be required to ensure that development of the site does not bring about the coalescence of Wilton and Salisbury. Transport issues are also identified with the potential to increase congestion, decrease air quality and increase traffic on an identified accident black spot. All these issues should be addressed before development is considered. The site shares many of the problems of sites 1 &amp; 2 but does offer some extra advantages. The cumulative impact of the development of sites 2, 3, and 4 on the outskirts of Salisbury should be considered.</p> <p>Page 24 of main SA report (STU/03) paragraph 4.23-4.24): <b>Fugglestone Red</b> - The site has a reasonable relationship to Salisbury and offers the potential for improvement of access to facilities for the existing adjacent somewhat isolated housing estate. Issues surrounding drainage and water abstraction and the</p>	3
		3

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>potential for adverse impact on the historic Wilton House are also identified. Careful design and layout would be required to ensure that development of the site does not bring about the coalescence of Wilton and Salisbury. Transport issues are also identified with the potential to increase congestion, decrease air quality and increase traffic on an identified accident black spot. It was considered that all these issues should be addressed before development is considered.</p> <p>Many of the above issues have now been addressed through the definition of the site boundaries which remove concerns about the impact on Wilton House and coalescence with Wilton and 1250 dwellings, 8ha of employment land and a new primary school are now proposed as a comprehensive mixed development. The former Imerys Quarry site, with an allocation for 4 ha of employment land was also part of the original Fugglestone Red area of search.</p>	
Landscape	<p>The Chris Blandford Associates Settlement Settings assessment (STU/21) (part 2, fig 3.5) through its Visual Assessment – identifies the Fugglestone Red area as having a townscape/ countryside interface is “elevated views, little/no foreground, generally harsh, abrupt settlement edge.</p> <p>STU/21 part 2, figure 3.6 analyses the Townscape and landscape of the settlement of Salisbury– the A36 and A360 which are the northern and southern boundaries of the area are “Green/Treed/River valley” approaches. “First views” and “urban gateways” to Wilton are to the west of the area, whereas those to Salisbury are to the east.</p> <p>STU/21 part 2 figures 3.7 look at the CBA Townscape and Landscape role and function. The study identifies that the majority of the site is “connective townscape/landscape”. These are areas of townscape/landscape which are an integral part of the settlements and their environs, but lack individual distinction, or do not play a significant contribution to the setting of settlements. This classification does not render these areas unimportant, or from lacking in their own identify. Rather, they are often areas divorced from or weakly attached to their landscape setting, or from landmarks within the landscape of historic cores. The use of mass-produced building</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p>Acknowledge potential convergence issue between Salisbury and Wilton, but effective masterplanning can address this issue.</p> <p>Most of the site is identified as landscape that is not distinctive or supportive.</p> <p>In townscape terms, much of the site is characterised as lacking individual distinction/does not play a significant contribution to the</p>

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>materials, standard suburban layouts, styles and details are also contributing factors in the lack of local identity.</p> <p>The North West corner of site is “supportive townscape/landscape”. These are areas of townscape/landscape which support the character of the historic cores and areas distinctive to the settlements. They provide the backdrop and ambience, and bolster the sense of place of the settlements and their approaches.</p> <p>Figure 3.8 of STU/21 (part 2) identifies any Special qualities to be safeguarded. Most of the site is identified as “landscape that is not distinctive or supportive” apart from the north west corner which is “distinctive and supportive landscape”.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9.14 identifies for area 11 (landscape that is not distinctive or supportive) that there is potential for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Softening of visually harsh and abrupt settlement edges Enhancement of public access to the area. Opportunities for sensitive, high quality, accessible green infrastructure allowing improved access to the countryside for urban populations e.g. development of public footpaths/cycle paths with connections to nearby green fingers/corridors.</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance distinctive approaches comprising a memorable green / treed character. Resist new development that disrupts the character of approach to and from Salisbury and Wilton, particularly along Devizes Road and The Avenue, respectively.</li> <li>• Consider the effects of any new development within this area on views to and from the chalk escarpment.</li> </ul> <p>For the north west corner which is within area 10 (distinctive and supportive landscape), which is a larger area encompassing the entirety of the surroundings of Wilton paragraph 3.9.11 identifies that:</p>	<p>setting of settlements.</p> <p>For the area that is distinctive and supportive the Fugglestone Red site forms a very small area of this and much of the landscape protection proposed can be provided in this small area.</p>

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve key views over the Nadder and Wylde river valleys that strongly contribute to memorable and distinctive approaches to Wilton;</li> <li>• Maintain and enhance the green / treed / river valley character of approach via the railway, which contributes to a locally distinctive and memorable approach to and from Salisbury;</li> <li>• Improve public access to the area, particularly along the river valleys. Opportunities for sensitive, high quality, accessible green infrastructure allowing improved access to the countryside for urban populations e.g. extension of public footpath / cycle path network and connections to other green fingers/corridors;</li> <li>• Conserve the historic rural setting of locally distinctive listed buildings within Burcombe and South Newton (within outer rural setting). Ensure the sense of setting, scale, form and inherent character of such clusters of buildings is not lost with the location of new development. Resist extension or intensification of linear/resist ribbon development along the Burcombe Road and Warminster Road;</li> <li>• Resist any new development that would adversely affect the open, undeveloped nature of the upper downland slopes and its skyline;</li> <li>• Conserve key views that strongly contribute to memorable and distinctive approaches to Salisbury. Resist new development that disrupts key views to important landmarks and features within Wilton and its setting</li> <li>• Consider the effects of any new development within this area on views to and from Wilton's historic core;</li> <li>• Resist new development that would result in any reduction in the area's tranquillity;</li> <li>• Potential to soften visually harsh and abrupt settlement edges in this area through additional tree and shrub planting.</li> </ul>	

Fugglestone Red		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Heritage	<p>The following evidence is taken from the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (STU/23 page 53)</p> <p><b>Sensitivities</b></p> <p><b>Known and unknown archaeology:</b> There is potential for unknown archaeology in the form of barrows and field systems recorded from cropmarks on aerial photographs.</p> <p><b>Setting and views to Old Sarum:</b> Old Sarum is currently not visible from the northern end of the site because of existing screening by trees. There should be building height restrictions and tree planting to the north of the site to ensure this remains the case.</p> <p><b>Setting and views associated with Wilton Park:</b> The site interrupts the rural and tree-lined Avenue approach to Wilton House and Park and development within the south eastern part of the site will be visible from within the Park unless screened (see mitigation measures below). This is likely to be further exacerbated by lighting associated with the development.</p> <p><b>Setting to the town of Wilton:</b> The setting of Wilton's conservation area is likely to be at risk due to the development site's size and prominence on the skyline on a slope looking down onto the settlement. This will be further exacerbated by the likely disturbance and traffic that the site will generate. The development site is out of scale with existing development and could further blur the boundary between the settlements of Wilton and Salisbury. It will be important to retain the visual break between the two settlements. The development could also impact on the visual gateway into Salisbury along the A360.</p> <p><b>Summary of impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall MODERATE risk of unknown archaeology on the site</li> <li>• Overall MODERATE risk to the setting of Wilton Park, the town of Wilton, the integrity of the Avenue and the approach to Salisbury as well as threatening the distinction between Wilton and Salisbury. It is therefore essential that there is very careful site planning to address these issues and that all the identified mitigation measures are taken into account.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p>Known heritage summary: Moderate risk</p>
		<p><b>2</b></p> <p>Potential Heritage: Moderate risk</p>
Transport	New transport evidence has now been provided within STU/52 Wiltshire Strategic	<b>2</b>

Fugglestone Red																
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score														
	<p>Transport Assessment. This has been prepared by Wiltshire Council to inform the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy.</p> <p>The study uses various software (paragraph 3.2.1) to identify accessibility to areas of search around settlements, including accession mapping and the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS). These all look at key transport indicators such as access to essential services and facilities; public transport service provision; highway network capacity; journey to work patterns and ranks area from the most accessible to the least accessible.</p> <p>The study as a whole looked at 162 areas / sites across the whole of Wiltshire. Appendix 4 of STU/52 provides an overall summary of results. Out of the four sites assessed in this appendix the Fugglestone Red (Salisbury_B) site ranks joint 3<sup>rd</sup> implying it is not as accessible in transport terms as the other sites within this Review.</p>															
Consultation Feedback	<p>CON/07 – the Our Place 1 Methodology and Output Report summarised the results of the Our Place in the Future 1 consultation and identified that just over 70% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Fugglestone Red and the UKLF site would be suitable for development.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis % Responses</th> <th>Base</th> <th>Strongly agree</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Neither agree or disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Strongly disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.</td> <td>432</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>45.8%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This site was consequently taken forward to the Preferred Options consultation, there were a limited amount of responses received either supporting or objecting to the inclusion of this site in the strategy, however responses which are summarised in CON/13 include.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This together with land to the north of this site and at Fugglestone Red could provide another 'new' community with support services.</li> </ul>	Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%	<p><b>3</b></p> <p>Coalescence issue can be addressed via effective masterplanning.</p>
Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree										
To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%										

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest relocating the business park to Old Sarum, High Post, Fugglestone Red instead of Harnham</li> <li>• Build at Durrington/Bulford or Fugglestone Red / MOD Wilton</li> </ul> <p>The site was again included within the 'evolved' preferred options consultation and responses (CON/17) on this site included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Totally agree with new houses focused on sites around Salisbury centre. Slightly concerned to lose city centre parking. Bishopdown Farm, Fugglestone Red good sites.</li> <li>• Fugglestone Red would add too much traffic.</li> <li>• Ok to Fugglestone Red, Amesbury, Old Sarum &amp; Hampton Park.</li> <li>• I think Fugglestone Red could be used for housing right through the fields until it reaches the UKLF.</li> <li>• Fugglestone Red is a problem I am far from convinced we need to build houses in the first place, suggests that case is made before a site is suggested</li> <li>• Fugglestone Red could be increased with not too much impact upon the landscape if done carefully.</li> <li>• Support allocation of Fugglestone Red phase 2.</li> <li>• In part - Fugglestone Red, Archer's Gate, Old Sarum and Bishopdown Farm seem appropriate.</li> <li>• Fugglestone Red should not be mixed use.</li> <li>• Strongly disagree with the new business park. There will be too much traffic. Alternative sites could be Old Sarum and Fugglestone Red.</li> <li>• There is a severe lack of local services in Fugglestone Red, everyone gets in a car just to buy bread, milk or a paper. When there are more houses up in this area a decent local shop is a priority (exclamation mark). It cannot be considered good service</li> <li>• I strongly disagree with Fugglestone Red development, but I'm sure you will take no notice so bear in mind.</li> <li>• Fugglestone Red Roundabout – Very poor visibility, single access point needs</li> </ul>	

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the proposal of employment in Fugglestone Red and</li> <li>• Old Sarum as housing will need to be balanced.</li> <li>• Support the identification of the site at Fugglestone Red within the document.</li> </ul> <p>As summarised within SWCS/12 (SWCS 12 Regulation 30 1 e Statement - Summary of Representations), community comments received on the SWCS Proposed Submission draft included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support inclusion of Fugglestone Red</li> <li>• Impact on SRN, and A36 and A360</li> <li>• Adverse landscape impacts</li> <li>• Coalescence of Salisbury and Wilton</li> <li>• Impact on protected trees</li> <li>• Impact on air quality</li> </ul> <p>Overall these consultation responses showed that the proposed site at Fugglestone Red has general support although a minority of parties still objected to the proposed development.</p>	
Water / flooding	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (STU/29 A) identifies that Fugglestone Red is located within flood zone 1 (low probability). This means that the site has an annual probability of flooding of 0.1% or less and that no sequential tests are needed.</p> <p>However discussions with Wessex Water and detailed in Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure (paragraph 4.25) identifies that the site requires the following water and waste infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boosted supply from existing local reservoir and a dedicated spine main to serve local distribution mains.</li> <li>• On site sewers required to be provided by developers with separate systems of drainage.</li> <li>• Off site surface water disposal to local land drainage systems with attenuated</li> </ul>	<p>3</p> <p>Low probability of flooding although water/drainage infrastructure necessary to support development.</p>

<b>Fugglestone Red</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>discharge needed to satisfy PPS25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On site foul-water pumping station with rising main to Devizes Road.</li> <li>• Long off site connecting sewer to agreed point of connection, where planning capacity is available to accept future foul flows.</li> </ul>	
Biodiversity / Wildlife	Opportunities to enhance natural environment, including the quality of the Camp Down SSSI, and the River Avon SAC.	<b>3</b>
Place-shaping	This site is a key site in facilitating the delivery of new buildings for the recently formed West Salisbury Academy to the south of the site. A new cemetery is to be provided within the site to meet the needs of the Salisbury city. A local centre is also proposed as part of the development with suitable community infrastructure such as health care, subject to need and viability. This local centre will provide wider community benefits to existing Fugglestone Red and Bemerton Heath residents – existing Fugglestone Red residents in particular do not currently have ready access to a local convenience store amongst other facilities.	<b>4</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>28</b>

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Sustainability	Section 11 of this report identifies that:	1
		1

<b>South of Netherhampton Road</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p><b>9 of the SA objectives were scored as having a positive impact, equating to 37.5%</b></p> <p><b>7 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 29%</b></p> <p>SA Summary:</p> <p>Page 99 of Appendix V of STU/03 of Area of Search SA – Salisbury Area 13</p> <p>An extensive area of search but the eastern part of the site does have good connections with Harnham. Archaeological evaluation and biodiversity survey and assessment required to ensure no harm to heritage interests or SSSI. Potential problems with local highway network need to be addressed. Allocation of employment land is proposed to encourage reduction of travel to work journeys. Development to the south west should be avoided due to landscape concerns, It is recommended that parts of the site should be given further consideration but that the cumulative impact of the development of sites 12, 13 and 14 [see Map X above] on social inclusion objectives, including provision of appropriate facilities, should be carefully addressed as should the impact on the vitality of Salisbury Town Centre.</p> <p><b>Land South of Netherhampton Road</b></p> <p>The SA recommended that (STU/03 paragraph 4.29, page 25 of main report) parts of the site should be given consideration due to good connections with Harnham. Employment development (10ha) is proposed with 400 dwellings and delivery of a local centre and community facilities to improve those presently in Harnham.</p>	
Landscape / Approach / Views	CBA: The Chris Blandford Associates Settlement Settings assessment (STU/21) (part 2,	<b>2</b>

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>fig 3.5) through its Visual Assessment – identifies that the area south of Netherhampton Road forms part of two visual areas. The first area has level views a mixed foreground and a mixed settlement edge. Moving to Elevated views, countryside or valley foreground, generally soft settlement edge. A ridgeline additionally comes into the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key elevated panoramic views from higher ground towards city centre</li> <li>• Distinctive ridgeline in the south</li> <li>• Primarily “elevated views, countryside or river foreground, generally soft settlement edge, however in the lowest parts to the Netherhampton Road it is “level views, mixed foreground, mixed settlement edge”. In the SE corner, it is “level views, countryside or river foreground, generally soft settlement edge”.</li> </ul> <p>STU/21 part 2, figure 3.6 analyses the Townscape and landscape of the settlement of Salisbury identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “first view” of Salisbury occurs between the livestock market and Netherhampton</li> <li>• An urban gateway is at the beginning of the development to the south of the A3094 travelling towards Harnham</li> <li>• The land to the west is open countryside separating Netherhampton from Coombe Bissett.</li> <li>• There is a “commercial” approach to the south of the A3094 and a “green/treed/river valley” approach to the north.</li> <li>• The Nadder Valley to the north of the area is a “green finger”.</li> </ul> <p>STU/21 part 2, figure 3.7 analyses the Townscape and landscape role and function and identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Primarily “supportive townscape/landscape”. These areas support the character of the historic cores and areas distinctive to the settlements. They provide the backdrop and ambience, and bolster the sense of place of</li> </ul>	<p>There are key elevated panoramic views from higher ground towards city centre</p> <p>Higher parts of site are distinctive townscape/landscape.</p> <p>Potential for development on this site to compromise visual and physical gap between Salisbury and Ebble Valley villages.</p>

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>the settlements and their approaches. Higher parts of the site are “distinctive townscape/landscape”. These areas are defined as specifically recognisable and distinctive to the settlements. They include townscape and landscape components such as quintessential views, the interaction of buildings forming spaces or the setting to local events, landform, setting and backdrops to the settlements, areas of rich biodiversity, historic approach routes and landmarks of distinctive character. These areas, frequently contiguous with the historic cores, often borrow from or bestow character to them.</p> <p>STU/21 figure 3.8 and paragraph 3.99 identifies this site as being within Area 8 with some key elevational views towards Salisbury. Special qualities to be Conserve the exposed grass, and in places well-wooded, chalk escarpment, which form a distinctive and visually prominent backdrop to many views from within Salisbury and its landscape setting. Resist new development that disrupts the undeveloped nature of the skyline. This is particularly important in northern parts of the area, where the escarpment is prominent in views from a wider landscape;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve key views that strongly contribute to memorable and distinctive approaches to Salisbury by public footpaths (including ancient trackways) and bridleways. Resist new development that disrupts key views to important landmarks and features within</li> <li>• Salisbury and its setting;</li> <li>• Consider the effects of any new development outside this area on views to and from the escarpment;</li> <li>• Resist new development that would result in any reduction in the area’s tranquillity;</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance locally distinctive approaches via road and public footpaths, comprising a memorable green / treed character. Resist new development that disrupts the character of approach to and from Salisbury;</li> <li>• Maintain visual and physical separation between Salisbury and springline villages along the River Ebble and ensure the sense of setting, scale, form and</li> </ul>	

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>inherent character of such villages is not lost with the location of new development. Resist extension of linear/ribbon development along Salisbury Road and Homington Road;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to soften visually harsh and abrupt settlement edges in this area through additional tree and shrub planting.</li> </ul>	
Heritage	<p>The following evidence is taken from the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (STU/23 page 91-92)</p> <p><b>Sensitivities</b></p> <p><b>Known and unknown archaeology:</b> Much potential for unknown archaeology in the form of prehistoric barrows, field systems and enclosures across the site.</p> <p><b>Setting and views to Salisbury and the Cathedral:</b> Water meadows are a key feature of the surrounding landscape, with important views across these to the Cathedral spire. The higher southern portion of the site is visible across the valley and from the centre of the City, making it more sensitive to development.</p> <p><b>Summary of impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall HIGH risk of unknown archaeology on the site</li> <li>• Overall LOW risk to the known historic environment so long as building heights are restricted on the southern end of the site and landscaping is used to frame views to the Cathedral.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p>Known heritage summary: Low risk. Note that this is considered to be a conservative rating, as the Historic Environment Assessment did not consider the full extent of the site proposed in the Core Strategy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p>Potential heritage: High risk</p>
Transport	<p>New transport evidence has now been provided within STU/52 Wiltshire Strategic Transport Assessment. This has been prepared by Wiltshire Council to inform the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy.</p> <p>The study uses various software (paragraph 3.2.1) to identify accessibility to areas of search around settlements, including accession mapping and the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS). These all look at key transport indicators such as access to essential services and facilities; public transport service</p>	<b>3</b>

South of Netherhampton Road																							
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score																					
	<p>provision; highway network capacity; journey to work patterns and ranks area from the most accessible to the least accessible.</p> <p>The study as a whole looked at 162 areas / sites across the whole of Wiltshire. Appendix 4 of STU/52 provides an overall summary of results. Out of the four sites assessed in this appendix Land south of Netherhampton Road (Salisbury_V) site ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> implying it is not as accessible in transport terms as some of the other sites within this Review.</p>																						
Consultation feedback	<p>CON/07 – the Our Place 1 Methodology and Output Report summarised the results of the Our Place in the Future 1 consultation and identified that just over 43.5% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Land south of Netherhampton Road would be suitable for development.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis % Responses</th> <th>Base</th> <th>Strongly agree</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Neither agree or disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Strongly disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.</td> <td>432</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>45.8%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.</td> <td>423</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>35.0%</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>22.2%</td> <td>13.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This site was consequently taken forward to the Preferred Options consultation. A number of responses were received with respect to land south of Netherhampton Road and these are summarised in CON/13 and include.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If these large housing areas have to be built, would it not be better to build them somewhere like the Netherhampton road,</li> <li>• or fields to the left of Laverstock as you enter from the A30</li> <li>• Maybe Netherhampton Road could take some of the industrial slack.</li> <li>• A better alternative to a business park at Harnham would be at Old Sarum or High Post.</li> </ul>	Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%	To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p>Particularly controversial site in terms of consultation responses. Development will clearly have some impact on water meadows and visual impact, as highlighted in the CBA Landscape Appraisal.</p>
Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree																	
To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%																	
To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%																	

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be no more housing or employment permitted along the glorious views of Salisbury or Netherhampton Road</li> <li>• Netherhampton Road does not have the capacity to support a major new business park</li> <li>• Netherhampton Road and Harnham Gyratory are already dangerously busy.</li> <li>• Maybe archaeological problems at Netherhampton Road</li> <li>• Modest development on the Netherhampton Road is supported but large housing developments on this scale would, we expect, cause unacceptable increases in commuter traffic through a residential area already suffering from constant through traffic.</li> <li>• Forget any ideas of a commercial park off Netherhampton Road or further house building off Netherhampton Road.</li> <li>• The re-location of Churchfields to Netherhampton Road is a complete non-starter.</li> <li>• The 800 houses and business park would create an unsustainable level of traffic on Netherhampton Road.</li> <li>• It is unrealistic to plan for high levels of housing/employment land to the south of Netherhampton Rd, Harnham.</li> <li>• To bring so many new jobs to a commercial park on Netherhampton Road in place of Churchfields will have a significant and serious impact on the local community.</li> <li>• I disagree strongly with your proposal to concentrate the major part of the industrial development at Netherhampton Road.</li> <li>• Netherhampton road is very unsuitable for a major industrial estate because of the traffic problems it will cause.</li> <li>• I can understand the need to relocate Churchfields Industrial Estate due to transport access. However, I do not feel that Netherhampton Road is the correct place for this.</li> <li>• Providing a new business park on the Netherhampton road where there are currently empty units on the current site seems ill advised,</li> </ul>	

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>The site was again included within the 'evolved' preferred options, albeit in reduced capacity (housing element had been removed) consultation and responses (CON/17) on this site included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No business to south of Netherhampton Road, Harnham is a residential corridor, and there is already very heavy traffic. Any extra would turn it into more gridlock.</li> <li>• We think houses should be built on Netherhampton Road and not Churchfields.</li> <li>• Netherhampton road if used as another business park will make us suffer from noisy heavy traffic vibration and congestion at the junction of Netherhampton &amp; Wilton road,</li> <li>• Agree apart from Churchfields proposal and Netherhampton Road</li> <li>• The proposal to create a major new business park on the Netherhampton Road I believe I catastrophically flawed.</li> <li>• Roads are too bad for realistic business park on Netherhampton Rd.</li> <li>• Primary concerns are in relation to the development of a new business park between Harnham Business Park and the Livestock</li> <li>• Market on the Netherhampton Road. Harnham business park has not attracted much attention, therefore why will a new business park at Netherhampton Road.</li> <li>• Object to any further development in the Netherhampton Road area.</li> <li>• Any industrial development along Netherhampton Rd would be a disaster in terms of traffic</li> <li>• Harnham does not need an industrial estate. I appreciate the need for more houses.</li> <li>• Primary concerns are in relation to the development of a new business park between Harnham Business Park and the Livestock Market on Netherhampton Road.</li> </ul> <p>The 'evolved' preferred options public consultation identified that the public were</p>	

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>not entirely happy with the concept of a major new business park at Harnham but did suggest that some housing might be satisfactory.</p> <p>As summarised within SWCS/12 (SWCS 12 Regulation 30 1 e Statement - Summary of Representations), community comments received on the SWCS Proposed Submission draft included:</p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will enable Vision projects to be achieved, particularly new land at Harnham that will help accommodate some of the businesses to be relocated from Churchfields.</li> <li>• Opportunity to improve and extend Harnham bus service</li> <li>• Good access to other employment opportunities</li> <li>• Site could be accessed through the contributions of two junctions along the A3094, one primarily residential, one primarily commercial</li> </ul> <p>Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for new employment sites is unproven/Surplus employment land available at Solstice Park/ Solstice Park, Old Sarum, High Post, London Road, Wilton MOD sites offer alternative employment land</li> <li>• Impact on traffic/Lack of transport study/ Dibden Bay Container Port will add to traffic flows through Harnham</li> <li>• Impact on Water Meadows</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Impact on archaeology</li> <li>• Inadequate capacity of foul drainage system/existing gas main and lack of funds to provide required improvements</li> <li>• More appropriate housing site near Salisbury District Hospital</li> <li>• Destruction of agricultural land</li> <li>• Inadequate school capacity</li> </ul>	

South of Netherhampton Road		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for new housing numbers is unproven. Council already building huge housing estate at Rowbarrow and at Amesbury, this is enough.</li> <li>• Visual impact</li> <li>• Larger area of employment land than is required is identified</li> <li>• Impact on SRN</li> <li>• Impact on air quality</li> <li>• Concern existing employment land may be compromised.</li> <li>• There is already employment land at Harnham that will help accommodate some of the businesses to be relocated from Churchfields.</li> <li>• Noise pollution</li> <li>• Plan now shows 400 houses - not shown on original consultation document.</li> <li>• Area identified for Netherhampton Road allocation is in excess for what is required to accommodate 400 dwellings and 10 ha of employment land. The DPD is grossly misleading as it earmarks a site more than two and a half times the requirement.</li> </ul>	
Water / flooding	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (STU/29A) identifies that Fugglestone Red is located within flood zone 1 (low probability). This means that the site has an annual probability of flooding of 0.1% or less and that no sequential tests are needed.</p> <p>However discussions with Wessex Water and detailed in Topic Paper 17 Infrastrucutre (paragraph 4.25) identifies that the site requires the following water and waste infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upstream network has limited capacity with reduced pressure. Significant network improvements will be required to provide additional capacity to serve development proposals.</li> <li>• Engineering appraisal will be required to determine the scope and extent of</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p>Low probability of flooding but “significant” network improvements needed to support development.</p>

<b>South of Netherhampton Road</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>these capacity improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On site sewers to be provided by developers with separate systems of drainage. There is no spare capacity in local networks for any significant development.</li> <li>• Surface water disposal to local land drainage systems with attenuated discharge is required to satisfy PPS25.</li> <li>• Capacity improvements to foul water system may be needed subject to engineering appraisal when development proposals are identified in more detail.</li> <li>• Cumulative development within the catchment will require downstream improvements.</li> </ul>	
Biodiversity / Wildlife	The proposal site is not subject of any statutory ecological designations or designated sites of importance for biodiversity (e.g. SPA's, SSSI's). Nor is it identified as an SNCI or County Wildlife Site. However, there is potential for negative effects on West Harnham Chalk Pit SSSI.	<b>3</b>
Place shaping	<p>The proposal includes delivery of a local centre and community facilities for the Harnham area. However, the existing community is self-sufficient (already has basic facilities such as convenience store, two pubs, church, primary school) so whilst new facilities as part of proposed strategic allocation would be accessible by the existing community, they would not be essential for the existing community in the same way, as say the community facilities being delivered at Fugglestone Red.</p> <p>This site does not immediately adjoin an existing area of residential development and does not therefore integrate with the community; this site is much more of a stand alone development compared to the other proposed strategic allocations.</p>	<b>2</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>19</b>

Longhedge		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Sustainability	<p>Section 11 of this report identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 of the SA objectives were scored as having a positive impact, equating to 58%.</li> <li>• 6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact, equating to 25%.</li> </ul> <p>SA Summary: The SA recommended that (STU/03 paragraph 4.27, page 25 of main report)</p> <p>The site was assessed in the light of proposed development on land to the south. The site is peripheral to the town but will have the benefit of accessing facilities in conjunction with Phase 1 of the Old Sarum development. It is further from the SAM but will still have landscape implications for distant views. However, the site does offer the opportunity to provide further facilities and provide a local centre. Landscape mitigation will be essential.</p> <p><b>Page 72 of Appendix V of STU/03 of Area of Search SA – Salisbury Area 7</b> This site has been assessed in the light of the allocation within the existing Local Plan (H2D) on land to the south of the A345. The site is peripheral to the town but will have the benefit of accessing facilities in conjunction with Phase 1 of the Old Sarum development. The land to the north east of the site could be considered for development but it is recommended that land to the south west be given careful consideration due to adverse impacts on archaeology and landscape. There is an opportunity to produce a management plan to open up Old Sarum as a museum of army flying which would support cultural heritage objectives.</p>	2
		3
Landscape / Approach / Views / CBA landscape appraisal	The Chris Blandford Associates Settlement Settings assessment (STU/21) (part 2, fig 3.5) through its Visual Assessment identifies the Longhedge site as a rural setting with necklace villages, including springline villages	3 This area separates “necklace”

<b>Longhedge</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>STU/21 part 2, figure 3.6 analysis the Townscape and Landscape of the settlement of Salisbury which identifies that the area consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• open countryside separating necklace villages and these villages and Salisbury/Wilton</li> <li>• The A345 to the west is a rural/vernacular approach to Salisbury</li> </ul> <p>STU/21 part 2 figures 3.7 looks at the CBA Townscape and Landscape Role and Function and identifies that the site in its entirety within an outer rural areas. These are areas of landscape from which distinctive views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is in providing a backdrop to views of the settlements, and in providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape.</p> <p>Figure 3.8 of STU/21 (part 2) identifies any Special Qualities to be safeguarded (fig 3.8) and identifies the A345 characteristic approach to Salisbury as an area to be protected.</p>	<p>villages in the Lower Woodford Valley and from Salisbury and Wilton. However, even if the site is developed, there would still be a significant gap between the edge of this development (A345) and the Lower Woodford Valley villages.</p>
Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (STU/23)	<p>The following evidence is taken from the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (STU/23 page 75)</p> <p><b>Sensitivities</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p>Known heritage summary : High risk</p>

Longhedge		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p><b>Known and unknown archaeology:</b> There is great potential for unknown prehistoric barrows, field systems and enclosures across the site as well as the possibility of further evidence of Roman activity associated with the Roman road and medieval remains.</p> <p><b>Setting and views to Old Sarum and the Roman road:</b> The scheduled Iron Age hillfort of Old Sarum would be compromised by development on this site with its associated traffic movements and lighting, particularly on the visible northern two-thirds of the site which is directly in view of Old Sarum. Old Sarum is the site of the original settlement of Salisbury and commands a prominent location in the landscape, Old Sarum hillfort is of paramount importance to the setting of the modern city, directly contributing to its rootedness and an understanding of its past evolution.</p> <p>The setting of the proposed development site is currently predominantly rural, with little visual connectivity with Salisbury itself. The northern two-thirds of the site are elevated, and will be bounded by open country on two sides even after existing development around the football ground is complete. The site is key to the setting of Old Sarum within a rural context, contributing to its visual prominence within the landscape. This will change to an extent when the development to the south east of the site is complete. But this existing development site is significantly less visible being on lower lying ground that is already largely developed. It will therefore have a significantly reduced effect on Old Sarum when compared with this proposed development site. The approach to Old Sarum and Salisbury from the north along the Roman road on the western edge of the site (A345) would be negatively affected by development. The Roman roads radiating from Salisbury are important features in the landscape and contribute directly to an appreciation of the City's regional status in the past, as well as the importance of its connectedness with other nearby cities.</p> <p><b>Summary of impacts</b></p>	<p>1</p> <p>Potential heritage: High risk</p>

<b>Longhedge</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>Overall HIGH risk of unknown archaeology on the site</p> <p>Overall HIGH risk to the setting of and views to and from Old Sarum and the integrity of the Roman Road, necessitating that the northern two-thirds of the site is NOT developed and that if development is undertaken on the southern part of the site the greatest care is taken to maintain the rural setting of Old Sarum, retain the visual setting to the Roman road and retain the visual dominance of Old Sarum when viewed within its rural setting.</p>	
<p>Transport / Highways Model</p>	<p>New transport evidence has now been provided within STU/52 Wiltshire Strategic Transport Assessment. This has been prepared by Wiltshire Council to inform the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy.</p> <p>The study uses various software (paragraph 3.2.1) to identify accessibility to areas of search around settlements, including accession mapping and the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS). These all look at key transport indicators such as access to essential services and facilities; public transport service provision; highway network capacity; journey to work patterns and ranks area from the most accessible to the least accessible.</p> <p>The study as a whole looked at 162 areas / sites across the whole of Wiltshire. Appendix 4 of STU/52 provides an overall summary of results. Out of the four sites assessed in this appendix Land around Longhedge / Old Sarum (Salisbury_A) site ranks joint 3<sup>rd</sup> implying it is not as accessible in transport terms as some of the other sites within this Review.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Consultation Feedback</p>	<p>CON/07 – the Our Place 1 Methodology and Output Report summarised the results of the Our Place in the Future 1 consultation and identified that just over 52.7% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Longhedge / Old Sarum would be suitable for development.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>As well as local objection, significant objection from statutory consultee</p>

Longhedge																																																
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score																																														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis % Responses</th> <th>Base</th> <th>Strongly agree</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Neither agree or disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Strongly disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.</td> <td>432</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>45.8%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.</td> <td>423</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>35.0%</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>22.2%</td> <td>13.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.</td> <td>414</td> <td>7.2%</td> <td>25.1%</td> <td>27.1%</td> <td>19.3%</td> <td>21.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.</td> <td>417</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>33.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.</td> <td>423</td> <td>15.1%</td> <td>37.6%</td> <td>22.7%</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>12.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This site was consequently taken forward to the Preferred Options consultation. However responses which are summarised in CON/13 include.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Old Sarum, where the principle of an urban extension to Salisbury has already been accepted...' Really! Please inform in us of any resolution, statement, agreement etc where this is</li> <li>• More houses in Old Sarum will impact on Laverstock</li> <li>• Too many houses have already been planned in Old Sarum without another 800</li> <li>• But Old Sarum is not within the Salisbury community area</li> <li>• Preferred option 7 is supported as it is clear that Salisbury (including its outer areas like Old Sarum) is the most sustainable location for new housing within the district and most new housing should be located there.</li> <li>• Land at Old Sarum housing site opposed</li> <li>• I oppose the sitting of 800 homes near Old Sarum.</li> <li>• The old Sarum estate would be a good place to develop. As it's quite isolated from the rest of Salisbury it will need great improvement in terms of facilities (shop, doctor, dentist, community centre, school, food outlets, etc)</li> <li>• At present time it would be preferable just to identify potential development sites such as Churchfields, Old Sarum and Salisbury</li> </ul>	Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%	To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%	To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.	414	7.2%	25.1%	27.1%	19.3%	21.3%	To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.	417	3.8%	16.3%	26.6%	19.9%	33.3%	To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.	423	15.1%	37.6%	22.7%	12.5%	12.1%	(English Heritage)				
Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree																																										
To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%																																										
To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%																																										
To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.	414	7.2%	25.1%	27.1%	19.3%	21.3%																																										
To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.	417	3.8%	16.3%	26.6%	19.9%	33.3%																																										
To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.	423	15.1%	37.6%	22.7%	12.5%	12.1%																																										

Longhedge		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>district Hospital.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 800 homes at Old Sarum will mean that Laverstock is eclipsed in size by what is currently a smaller community within the parish.</li> <li>• English Heritage has considerable concern with an additional 800 new homes 'around Old Sarum' in addition to, and in light of, the evident impact of the new development currently under construction.</li> <li>• LEAVE OLD SARUM ALONE!</li> <li>• Slow down! If and when the Old Sarum development is completed and sold then in the time to take a pragmatic evidence based assessment of future housing needs</li> <li>• Relocate to Old Sarum, Solstice Park etc.</li> <li>• I would like to see all of the land around Salisbury hospital, land around Old Sarum and land to the North Eastern Fringes allocated to the southern areas where it rightfully belongs.</li> <li>• Land around Salisbury Hospital, Land around Old Sarum (800) and land to the North Eastern Fringes (500). There is no explanation, rationale or justification for this.</li> </ul> <p>The site was again included within the 'evolved' preferred options consultation and responses (CON/17) on this site included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• But why Old Sarum and Churchfields?</li> <li>• Provided no development around unique historic sites (such as Old Sarum) is handled sensitively</li> <li>• Old Sarum an Fugglestone are not suitable nor needed nor is Hampton Park</li> <li>• Ok to Fugglestone Red, Amesbury, Old Sarum &amp; Hampton Park.</li> <li>• Old Sarum - no.</li> <li>• There should be no more development around Old Sarum</li> <li>• Old Sarum needs very sympathetic handling not to ruin this historic site.</li> <li>• Do not agree with new houses around Old Sarum. This is such an historic site that any development near it has to be planned very</li> </ul>	

<b>Longhedge</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>carefully. It could not handle 300 new homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 houses around Old Sarum is out of keeping with this ancient monument and must not be allowed.</li> <li>• Concerned about how visible site in Old Sarum will be.</li> <li>• As mentioned Old Sarum could be considerably enlarged in a northerly direction without compromising green-belt or strategic gap land.</li> <li>• Old Sarum, Porton Down and Boscombe Down triangle are more suitable for employment development</li> <li>• no more development at old Sarum - no infrastructure</li> <li>• Old Sarum should not be developed (housing or industry) as it would effect the character of the ancient site</li> <li>• Provided the development near Old Sarum is screened properly</li> <li>• Alternative sites could be Old Sarum and Fugglestone</li> <li>• I feel very strongly that Old Sarum which ideally includes the view seen from the hill itself should be preserved as possible in its present state.</li> <li>• I feel that the Old Sarum, Archers Gate, Hampton Park and Fugglestone Red developments should only be residential - not for other uses</li> <li>• I have concerns over the amount of development at Hampton Park and Old Sarum both within the Parish of Laverstock.</li> </ul> <p>As summarised within SWCS/12 (SWCS 12 Regulation 30 1 e Statement - Summary of Representations), community comments received on the SWCS Proposed Submission draft included:</p> <p><b>Longhedge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on setting of Old Sarum SAM and Airfield Conservation Area</li> <li>• Remoteness from town centre,</li> <li>• Impact on archaeology</li> <li>• No one is signed up to deliver site.</li> <li>• The Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment April 2009 demonstrates the unsuitability of at least 2/3rds of the site.</li> </ul>	

Longhedge		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No long term vision for the site or for the settlement of Old Sarum</li> <li>Impact on Laverstock and Ford parish.</li> </ul> <p>English Heritage objection: The Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment April 2009, is included as part of the Core Strategy's evidence. It clearly demonstrates the unsuitability of at least 2/3rds of the site for various direct and indirect reasons. English Heritage considers for the reasons demonstrated by this independent evidence the designation as identified is unjustified and contrary to national policy.</p> <p>Whilst the principle of development may have been established for the current development taking place to the north of Old Sarum airfield, it does not establish the principle of further development in this area of open countryside</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not consider the future role of the settlement of Old Sarum and does not feature in the hierarchy. There is no indication of a long term vision for it.</p>	
Water / flooding	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (STU/29A) identifies that the Longhedge site is located within flood zone 1 (low probability). This means that the site has an annual probability of flooding of 0.1% or less and that no sequential tests are needed.</p> <p>However discussions with Wessex Water and detailed in Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure (paragraph 4.25) identifies that the site requires the following water and waste infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowner should pay particular attention to drainage and the control of surface water by the use of SUDS.</li> <li>Engineering assessment of water and foul sewer drainage at the site and potential capacity improvements at Petersfinger sewerage works</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p>Low probability of flooding although water/drainage infrastructure will be necessary to support development. Also issue with cumulative development of this site, Hampton Park and Old Sarum.</p>

<b>Longhedge</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	<p>and potable water capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative development within the upstream catchment at Old Sarum, Hampton Park and Longhedge developments will trigger significant works with new relief sewer to ensure that risk from sewer flooding is resolved.</li> </ul>	
Biodiversity / Wildlife	No statutory or non-statutory sites of nature conservation value occur within or immediately adjacent to the site. Opportunity to create biodiversity around SUDS.	<b>3</b>
Place shaping	The introduction of additional dwellings to the Old Sarum area will add a critical mass to secure the delivery and viability of planned and new local facilities to create a more self-contained community based around a neighbourhood centre.	<b>3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>21</b>

<b>Hampton Park</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
Sustainability	Section 11 of this report identifies that:	
	<p><b>9 of the SA objectives were scored as having a positive impact, equating to 39%</b></p> <p><b>6 of the SA objectives were scored as having a negative impact,</b></p>	
		<b>1</b>
		<b>2</b>

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Landscape / Approach / Views / CBA landscape appraisal	<p>The Chris Blandford Associates Settlement Settings assessment (STU/21) (part 2) through its Visual Assessment identifies the area as having two specific characters. Part of site is classified as having “elevated views, little/no foreground, generally harsh, abrupt settlement edge” whilst the North east area is “rural setting with necklace villages” (including springline villages). In addition there is a ridgeline in southern part of site that forms the proposed country park area. In addition this Country Park area has key elevated panoramic view to Salisbury from southern part of site (this is proposed as country park)</p> <p>STU/21 part 2, figure 3.6 analyses the Townscape and landscape of the settlement of Salisbury. This identifies that the site has some key townscape and landscape features: The southern part of the site is a “green finger” between Paul’s Dene and Bishopdown. This is proposed as part of the Country Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green finger between Winterbourne Earls and Laverstock runs through the north eastern corner of the site</li> <li>- Open countryside separating Old Sarum airfield area and village of Ford from Salisbury. A strategic landscape gap is planned a part of the proposed development of this site to address this issue.</li> <li>- Urban gateway at junction of A345 and Old Castle Road, to the west of the site. Urban gateway on London Road (A30) to east of site.</li> </ul> <p>STU/21 part 2 figures 3.7 look at the Townscape and Landscape Role and Function. The study identifies that the site primarily consists of supportive townscape / landscape. These are areas which support the character of the historic cores and areas distinctive to the settlements. They provide the backdrop and ambience, and bolster the sense of place of the settlements and their approaches.</p> <p>In addition, the Northern part of site is an “outer rural area”. This is where most of the actual proposed development will be located. These are areas of landscape from which distinctive views of the</p>	3

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is in providing a backdrop to views of the settlements, and in providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape.</p> <p>Figure 3.8 of STU/21 (part 2) identifies any Special Qualities to be safeguarded identifies the site as distinctive and supportive landscape. This includes the area for the proposed country park. The north east corner of the site is described as a 'Rural setting with scattered villages'. Figure 3.8 identifies part of the proposed site as falling into Area 2 and that the aim should be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the perception of a compact settlement, contained in a unique 'bowl' shaped formation within the chalk downlands. Resist new development that weakens this perception;</li> <li>• Maintain the sense of tranquillity and conserve key views from the chalk downland over Salisbury and within its river valley setting;</li> <li>• Conserve the exposed, and in places wooded, chalk escarpment, which form a distinctive and visually prominent backdrop to many views from within Salisbury. Resist new development that disrupts the undeveloped nature of the skyline;</li> <li>• Potential to soften visually harsh and abrupt settlement edges in this area through additional tree and shrub planting.</li> </ul>	

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
Heritage Assets / Archaeology / EH appraisal	<p>The following evidence is taken from the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment (STU/23 page 60)</p> <p><b>Sensitivities (from STU/23 p60)</b>  <b>Known and unknown archaeology:</b>  There is great potential for unknown archaeology on the site in the form of field systems and further Roman and medieval remains.</p> <p><b>Setting and views to Old Sarum and the Roman road:</b> The Assessment concludes that Old Sarum and its setting would be greatly compromised by development on the western half of this site (<b>Map 7.2</b>) both by the development itself and the increased activity that will come with the development in what is still a rural area. It would lead to the dilution of the dominance of Old Sarum. Being the original site of the settlement of Salisbury and commanding such a prominent location in the landscape, Old Sarum is of paramount importance to the setting of the modern city, directly contributing to it's rootedness with its past in an accessible and visual way.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p>Known heritage summary: Low risk</p> <p>The “western half” of the site referred to is not actually part of the allocation. Hence, it is considered appropriate that the “high risk” grading is downgraded to “low risk”.</p> <p>It is also important to note that English Heritage now accept in the Statement of Common Ground prepared in advance of the EiP that the recommendations of the Historic Environment Assessment 2009 have been considered.</p>

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p><b>However, it should be noted that the western part of the site referred to above does not actually form part of the allocation.</b></p> <p>The approach to Old Sarum along the Roman road following the northern edge of the site is equally sensitive. This again is key to an understanding of Old Sarum and it's prominence within the landscape. Furthermore, development on either side of the Roman road, with its associated lighting and disturbance would significantly erode its classically Roman straight-as-a-die character - the rural setting of the road is of great importance to appreciating it in context.</p> <p><b>Setting and views to Salisbury:</b> While the site is not that sensitive to views to listed buildings and the Cathedral, development may be visible and dominant on the skyline when viewed from Salisbury city centre. This in turn would reduce the current prominence of Old Sarum on the horizon. However, where the site slopes to the east, this visual intrusion is much less apparent (see <b>Map 7.2</b>).</p> <p><b>Summary of impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall HIGH risk of unknown archaeology on the site</li> <li>• Overall HIGH risk to the setting of and views to and from Old Sarum and the integrity of the Roman Road, necessitating that the western half of the site is NOT developed and that if development is undertaken on the eastern half of the site the greatest care is taken to maintain the rural setting of Old Sarum, retain the visual setting to the Roman road and retain the visual dominance of Old Sarum when viewed from the city centre.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p>Potential heritage: High risk</p>
Transport / Highways Model	<p>New transport evidence has now been provided within STU/52 Wiltshire Strategic Transport Assessment. This has been prepared by Wiltshire Council to inform the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy.</p> <p>The study uses various software (paragraph 3.2.1) to identify accessibility</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p>

Hampton Park		Score																																										
Assessment Criteria	Comments																																											
	<p>to areas of search around settlements, including accession mapping and the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS). These all look at key transport indicators such as access to essential services and facilities; public transport service provision; highway network capacity; journey to work patterns and ranks area from the most accessible to the least accessible.</p> <p>The study as a whole looked at 162 areas / sites across the whole of Wiltshire. Appendix 4 of STU/52 provides an overall summary of results. Out of the four sites assessed in this appendix Land around Hampton Park (Salisbury_C) site ranks 1<sup>st</sup> implying it is more accessible in transport terms than some of the other sites within this Review.</p>																																											
Consultation Feedback	<p>CON/07 – the Our Place 1 Methodology and Output Report summarised the results of the Our Place in the Future 1 consultation and identified that just over 32.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Hampton Park would be suitable for development.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Analysis % Responses</th> <th>Base</th> <th>Strongly agree</th> <th>Agree</th> <th>Neither agree or disagree</th> <th>Disagree</th> <th>Strongly disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.</td> <td>432</td> <td>25.0%</td> <td>45.8%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.</td> <td>423</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>35.0%</td> <td>20.3%</td> <td>22.2%</td> <td>13.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.</td> <td>414</td> <td>7.2%</td> <td>25.1%</td> <td>27.1%</td> <td>19.3%</td> <td>21.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.</td> <td>417</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>33.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.</td> <td>423</td> <td>15.1%</td> <td>37.6%</td> <td>22.7%</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>12.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This site was consequently taken forward to the Preferred Options consultation. However responses which are summarised in CON/13 include.</p>	Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%	To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%	To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.	414	7.2%	25.1%	27.1%	19.3%	21.3%	To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.	417	3.8%	16.3%	26.6%	19.9%	33.3%	To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.	423	15.1%	37.6%	22.7%	12.5%	12.1%	3
Analysis % Responses	Base	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree																																						
To the north western between Fugglestone Red and UK Land Command, Wilton.	432	25.0%	45.8%	20.1%	4.6%	4.4%																																						
To the west at Harnham on land to the south of Netherhampton Road.	423	8.5%	35.0%	20.3%	22.2%	13.9%																																						
To the northeast on land between Bishopdown Farm and the village of Ford.	414	7.2%	25.1%	27.1%	19.3%	21.3%																																						
To the east of Laverstock below Cockey Down.	417	3.8%	16.3%	26.6%	19.9%	33.3%																																						
To the north on land at the Portway near to Old Sarum.	423	15.1%	37.6%	22.7%	12.5%	12.1%																																						

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why not link the existing development of Hampton Park with the new development at Old Sarum.</li> <li>• Representation provides support for the identification of land north of Bishopdown, Salisbury, for 500 dwellings within Preferred Option 29.</li> <li>• Do not build between Bishopdown Farm / Hampton Park and Ford</li> <li>• I oppose the location of additional housing on the land to the North East of Hampton Park/Bishopdown Farm</li> <li>• The development of Hampton Park II, provides the opportunity to complete the previous development to the south of</li> <li>• Pearce Way and facilitate a wider open space and recreational strategy for the north east of Salisbury. →</li> <li>• We do not want an extension of Bishopdown / Hampton Park. We do not want these beautiful views spoiled.</li> <li>• If there has to be a change to this field consider using SOME of the area between Bishopdown Farm/Hampton Park and Ford allotments.</li> </ul> <p>The site was again included within the 'evolved' preferred options consultation and responses (CON/17) on this site included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to the planned development at Hampton Park we need: Less than 500 homes.</li> <li>• Old Sarum and Fugglestone are not suitable nor needed nor is Hampton Park</li> <li>• Ok to Fugglestone Red, Amesbury, Old Sarum &amp; Hampton Park.</li> <li>• I feel that the Old Sarum, Archers Gate, Hampton Park and Fugglestone Red developments should only be residential</li> <li>• When deciding the number of houses for Hampton Park you must consult Greentrees Primary School to see how much the school can expand. The number of houses must tie into school capability.</li> <li>• I have concerns over the amount of development at Hampton Park and Old Sarum both within the Parish of Laverstock.</li> <li>• Hampton Park: Accept additional housing is needed. Needs to done</li> </ul>	

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<p>with caution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments following the public meeting at Greentrees school on the 8 October 2008. 500 houses between Hampton Park and Ford is too high.</li> <li>• New houses to built on Salisbury Retail Park site and Pearce Way/London road roundabout, not the strategic gap between Ford and Hampton Park.</li> <li>• If developments go ahead, following needs to be considered: 1) Strategic green gap be enlarged between Ford and Hampton Park. 2) Retirement bungalows to be included in housing developments. 3) Traffic needs be considered.</li> <li>• Proposals for Greenfield sites seem odd as not all the brownfield sites have been used. Would like to keep the strategic gap between Ford and Hampton Park.</li> <li>• Totally opposed to the suggestion that 500 new houses should be built on the farmland to the north of Hampton Park for numerous valid reasons.</li> <li>• Concerned because it appears that any proposed development may be built in front of my house along Pearce Way. Any new houses should be built on the Salisbury Retail Park, not on the Strategic gap between Hampton Park and Ford.</li> </ul> <p>As summarised within SWCS/12 (SWCS 12 Regulation 30 1 e Statement - Summary of Representations), community comments received on the SWCS Proposed Submission draft included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully support identification of land at Hampton Park. This is in accordance with PPS12 paragraph 4.6 and 4.7.</li> <li>• Council has demonstrated a sound approach to site selection and has worked closely with developers to ensure that the site is deliverable in the short term.</li> <li>• Coalescence between Salisbury and Ford</li> <li>• Impact on views from east and north</li> </ul>	

Hampton Park		
Assessment Criteria	Comments	Score
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on setting of Old Sarum SAM/landscape</li> <li>• Housing numbers; site is too small for 500 houses</li> <li>• Strategic landscape gap is a token</li> <li>• Impact on Laverstock and Ford parish.</li> </ul> <p>English Heritage objections: We accept that the recommendations of the Salisbury Historic Environment Assessment April 2009 have been considered however we would suggest greater clarity is provided in respect of managing change in such an important historic location. This could reflect guidance applied to the proposed urban extension (reflected in the Core Strategy submission version) to the east of Swindon. Again, we recommend liaison with the county archaeologist who has had detailed involvement with guiding such an allocation.</p>	
Water / flooding	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (STU/29A) identifies that Hampton Park is located within flood zone 1 (low probability). This means that the site has an annual probability of flooding of 0.1% or less and that no sequential tests are needed.</p> <p>However discussions with Wessex Water and detailed in Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure (paragraph 4.25) identifies that the site requires the following water and waste infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated spine main to provide capacity. Sewers: limited capacity – requires off-site link plus extensive downstream improvements.</li> <li>• Cumulative development within the upstream catchment at Old Sarum, Hampton Park and Longhedge developments will trigger significant works with new relief sewer to ensure that risk from sewer flooding is resolved.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p>Low probability of flooding, although water/drainage infrastructure will be necessary to support development. Also issue with cumulative development of this site, Longhedge and Old Sarum.</p>
Biodiversity / Wildlife	<p>The site is adjacent to the Bourne Tributary to the River Avon SAC. Part of the site is a County Wildlife Site. Provision of country park provides</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p>

<b>Hampton Park</b>		
<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
	opportunity to enhance biodiversity.	
Place shaping	The proposed development provides for a substantial 51 ha of green space, to be formed into a new Country Park for public access, benefiting both existing residents as well as the new development at Hampton Park. The Park is intended to create usable open space within the City, where at present there is limited public access to the surrounding countryside and will provide a range of features for recreation and ecological enhancement. Some proposed key features include: picnic areas, turf maze, allotments, new pedestrian and cycle network, local equipped areas of play/local area of play, flower meadow, chalk grassland, new planting of native vegetation and a community orchard. The proposed development includes access points which aim to draw existing residents through the development and out into the Country Park.	<b>3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>24</b>



## Appendix 2 – Key Focussed Changes to the SWCS submission document

The proposed focused changes arising from the review of the housing and employment requirements of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Proposed Submission Draft are set out below. All other changes are consequential to these and are not shown here.

All changes including consequential changes are available to view on <http://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=130&MId=944&Ver=4>

Underlined text represents new text within the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, ~~strike through~~ text represents deletions. Please note this represents changes to the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Proposed Submission Draft as proposed by the Council in light of this review and **DOES NOT** incorporate any changes that were discussed during the EIP.

Page numbers have been provided that correspond with those in the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Proposed Submission Draft (July 2009).

SWCS Page 30, paragraph 4.3:

**Strategic Objective 2:** To provide everyone with access to a decent, affordable home. This Strategy makes provision for ~~12,400~~ 9,900 new homes in South Wiltshire to meet demand up to 2026.

It sets out a plan for an appropriate mix of types, sizes and tenures, particularly in order to address affordable housing needs. It identifies deliverable strategic sites to ensure there is a rolling five-year supply of housing.

Desired outcomes:

- The delivery of ~~12,400~~ 9,900 new homes carefully managed to be in the most sustainable location and to respect the local character. Well over half the number will have been built in or around Salisbury, with significant growth in Amesbury.
- More modest growth proportionate to the size of the settlement will have been delivered in the local centres of Mere, Downton, Wilton and Tisbury.
- The Strategy has addressed the shortfall in affordable homes across South Wiltshire through ensuring a minimum of 40% of such homes have been delivered in all new schemes of 15 or more houses and 25% on developments of 5 to 14 houses.
- All new homes meet the Lifetime Homes Standards, to allow more of the ageing population to live in their own communities.
- New homes have delivered water efficiency improvements and where possible, will be low carbon or carbon neutral
- The regeneration of the UK Land Forces HQ in Wilton with a significant number of new homes matched by employment opportunities will have taken place.
- The regeneration of Salisbury will have been achieved through a residential led mixed-use development on the Churchfields Estate.
- New pitches will have been provided for gypsies and travellers.

**Headline performance indicator:**

Net additional homes provided per year (National indicator 154 to be monitored through AMR).

Target: average of ~~620~~ 495 new homes per year.

**Strategic Objective 3:** To deliver a thriving economy which provides a range of job opportunities to match a growing population and where traditionally strong sectors, such as scientific research and development, continue to be world leaders.

To facilitate economic growth in a sustainable manner, this Strategy will deliver the following outcomes over the next 20 years:

Desired outcomes:

- Land will have been identified in sustainable locations to provide for about ~~43,900~~ 10,400 new jobs up to 2026.
- The business aspirations of Porton Down, Boscombe Down, Salisbury District Hospital and the MOD will have been delivered.
- Growth sectors specific to South Wiltshire, such as biotechnology and military sectors will have been successfully facilitated.
- Relocation of businesses from the Churchfields Estate to more unconstrained locations will have been implemented.
- The regeneration projects identified through the Salisbury Vision, such as redevelopment of the Maltings/Central Car Park will have been delivered.
- The loss of 1200 jobs caused by the relocation of the UK Land Forces HQ away from Wilton will have been mitigated.
- Strategic employment growth will have been designed to meet ~~SWRSS~~ and building regulation environmental targets in order to contribute to the delivery of a low carbon economy.

Headline performance indicator:

Creation of new jobs per year (monitored on NOMIS figures at [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk) and reported in AMR).

Target: average of ~~690~~ 520 jobs per annum (~~as per SWRSS requirement~~)

### **Core Policy 1 - The Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth in South Wiltshire**

This strategy plans for the delivery of ~~12,400~~ 9,900 dwellings and ~~13,900~~ 10,400 jobs over the period to 2026. The growth required to meet local needs will be accommodated in the following manner:

#### Salisbury and Wilton Community Areas

##### Salisbury and Wilton.

Planned growth:

~~7,480~~ 6060 homes and ~~36~~ 29 ha (~~30~~ 23 ha new allocation and 6 ha saved) of employment land. A retail-led mixed-use development is also planned.

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

##### Wilton Community Area

Planned growth:

~~Wilton Local Service Centre: 620 homes, 3 ha of employment land~~

~~Rest of Wilton Community Area: 950~~ 220 homes

Wilton is the Local Service Centre for its Community Area ~~and relates to Development Policy B in the SWRSS.~~ 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 SWRSS Development Policy C), which are~~ Broad Chalke, Dinton and Great Wishford, where limited growth will be appropriate.

##### Amesbury Community Area

Planned growth:

~~Amesbury Service Centre: 4960~~ 2100 homes.

~~Rest of Amesbury Community Area: 690~~ 295 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 between Amesbury, Durrington and Bulford mean that they constitute a unique group of settlements within South Wiltshire that ~~neither conforms to the SSCT category nor is~~ not directly comparable with any other category of settlement. ~~the Local Service Centres or any of the Village categories.~~ Amesbury Community Area contains the majority of allocated employment land in South Wiltshire (outside Salisbury ~~of the SSCT~~), including land at Solstice Park, Boscombe Down and Porton Down. Porton, Shrewton, and Tilshead are secondary villages in this community area, as well as "The Winterbournes" collectively. These settlements ~~conform to Development Policy C of the SWRSS and perform a complementary role to Amesbury, Durrington and Bulford, each having a range a more local~~ of services, which serve the surrounding areas.

**Core Policy 1 - The Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth in South Wiltshire  
(Continued from above)**

Southern Wiltshire Community Area

Planned Growth:

Downton Local Service Centre: 190 homes

Rest of Southern Wiltshire Community Area: ~~550~~ 365 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 with one of eight strategically important employment sites in South Wiltshire located in Downton. The secondary villages (~~equivalent to SWRSS Development Policy C~~) in the Southern Wiltshire Community Area are Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Morgan's Vale/Woodfalls, Pitton, Whiteparish and The Winterslows. These villages provide a reasonable level of local services and facilities where modest growth will be appropriate. The proximity of Salisbury to the north means that a number of settlements located in the northern part of this community area have a much stronger functional relationship with the City ~~performing~~ which performs the role of the service centre, rather than with Downton.

Mere Community Area

Planned Growth:

Mere Local Service Centre: ~~270~~ 200 homes 3 ha of employment land

Rest of Mere Community Area: 0 50 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 west of South Wiltshire. This Community Area is unique in South Wiltshire in that there are no settlements that perform a secondary village role and hence it is anticipated that the majority of growth will take place in Mere over the plan period. A subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD will identify where ~~where~~ exactly this growth will take place ~~will be identified through a subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD~~. 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 Local Service Centre: ~~460~~ 200 homes. 1.4 ha of employment land

Rest of Tisbury Community Area: ~~270~~ 220 homes

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. Fovant, Hindon and Ludwell are the secondary villages in this Community Area. These villages provide a reasonable level of local services and facilities and can accommodate reasonable levels of growth. Specific sites that can accommodate this growth will be identified through a subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD.

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 focussed on the Secondary Villages in each Community Area. In addition, infill development will be permitted in the Small Villages of Barford St Martin, Bodenham, Britford, Chilmark, Figheldean/Ablington, Fonthill Bishop, Fovant, Gomeldon, Great Wishford, Middle Woodford, Newton Toney, Odstock, Orcheston, Stapleford, Steeple Langford, Wylde and Zeals. Exception development, based on identified local need, will also be permitted in these villages.

**Core Policy 1 - The Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth in South Wiltshire  
(Continued from above)**

~~New housing will not be permitted outside the settlements named in Core Policy 1~~

~~[nb. numbers rounded]~~

~~Note: All numbers have been rounded up and include a contingency allowance.~~

Targets: Qualitative: The delivery of levels of growth in conformity with the Settlement Strategy; average of ~~620~~ 495 housing completions per year; 34% of housing completions per year to be on previously-developed land.

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.

Policies replaced: Policy H1

SWCS Page 49, paragraph 5.22:

**Core Policy 2: Strategic Allocations**

Planning permission will be granted for proposals that meet the requirements set out in the Development Templates at Appendix A of this document, for the following sites:

uses	Housing	Employment and other
Fugglestone Red	1250 dwellings	8 ha
Hampton Park	500 dwellings	0 ha
Longhedge (Old Sarum)	<del>800</del> <u>450</u> dwellings	8 ha
Churchfields & Engine Sheds	1100 dwellings	5 ha to be retained
UKLF	450 dwellings	3 ha
<del>South of Netherhampton Road</del>	<del>400 dwellings</del>	<del>10 ha</del>
Central Car Park	200 dwellings	Up to 40,000 sq m
gross external area		retail and leisure
floorspace		
Kings Gate, Amesbury	1300 dwellings	0 ha
Former Imerys Quarry	0 dwellings	4 ha

### **Core Policy 2: Strategic Allocations (continued)**

The specific, detailed infrastructure requirements to allow this Strategy to be delivered are included in the Area Visions (Chapters 6-11), the Development Templates at Appendix A and Integrated Delivery Plan at Appendix E. Key strategic elements of infrastructure central to the delivery of this plan are:

- New secondary school capacity for Salisbury.
- New primary schools at strategic sites at Fugglestone Red, Hampton Park, Longhedge, ~~Hannam~~ and Kings Gate.
- Additional doctor and dentist surgery capacity.
- Adequate fire service response to areas of new growth.
- Green Infrastructure linkages.
- Retention of important green infrastructure to the northern slopes and the green lung running south from land east of Old Sarum and west of Hampton Park.
- Demand Management measures to alleviate additional traffic pressures on Salisbury ring road.
- A strategy for mitigating phosphate levels in the watercourses.
- An integrated 'water grid' to ensure water supply.

Targets: See Core Policy 1; Reduction in local unemployment figures.

Monitoring and Review: AMR housing completions; NOMIS official labour market statistics.

Delivery Responsibility: Wiltshire Council; Developers.

Policies replaced: None

SWCS Page 59, paragraph 5.46 (b):

#### **5.46 (b) Strategic areas of search around Salisbury**

The map 'potential areas for strategic growth in and around Salisbury/Wilton' in topic paper 19

~~site selection process and SHLAA have indicated~~ broad areas of search around Salisbury. ~~which may provide in the region of 1000 additional homes.~~ As part of our ongoing monitoring process, if further land is required in the future, the sites at Netherhampton and an additional phase at Longhedge should be considered. If necessary further work through a site allocation DPD will be required to further investigate these sites to see if they are deliverable.

SWCS Page 143, Appendix A (Hampton Park development template)

**Place shaping requirements:**

In addition to the provisions of 'Creating Places' and saved Local Plan policies, master planning of this site needs to specifically address:

- Safeguarding zone for the high pressure gas main
- A strongly defined urban/rural edge to the north of the site
- The layout and utility of the Country Park to be agreed with the local community forum.
- Any master plan must ensure the delivery of a significant ~~Defining the~~ strategic gap between the development and the settlement of Ford, the size of which is to be agreed with the local planning authority in discussion with the community forum prior to submission of a planning application.
- A community forum to include local parish councillors from Laverstock and Ford Parish Council and the local Division members be established to help steer the development for the site and ensure that outcomes best meet local aspirations.

SWCS Page 164, Appendix A (Longhedge development template)

**Objectives for the development**

To develop a housing led mixed use development of ~~800~~ 450 dwellings and 8 ha of employment, through a high quality master plan which delivers an appropriate sense of place in accordance with the South Wiltshire Design Guide, 'Creating Places' in a sustainable location, in a manner which compliments the existing community and makes a significant strategic contribution to meeting local housing needs of South Wiltshire.

SWCS Page 161 to 163, Appendix A (South of Netherhampton Road development template)  
**Delete all**