

- City of London
- Glasgow
- Edinburgh



JNS/CJM/LS/PD7195
email: julian.stephenson@montagu-evans.co.uk

18 February 2010

Ian Kemp
Programme Officer
South Wiltshire Core Strategy
36 Campbell Street
Rugby
Warwickshire
CV21 2HY

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Clarges House
6-12 Clarges Street
London W1J 8HB

Tel: 020 7493 4002

Fax: 020 7312 7548

www.montagu-evans.co.uk

Dear Mr Kemp

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

Further to our telephone conversations and on behalf of our clients, the Harvest Partnership Limited, we set out below additional representations to be considered by the Inspector at the forthcoming examination. We have utilised the key questions as identified by the Inspector to provide a framework for each response.

Introduction

We act on behalf of the Harvest Limited Partnership (hereafter referred to as Harvest), which was formed in November 2007 and is 50/50 joint venture between Land Securities plc and J Sainsbury's plc. In December 2007, Harvest purchased the long leasehold of the Maltings Shopping Centre from Town Centre Securities. The site comprises the existing Sainsbury's superstore, 27 retail units and the adjoining multi-storey car park with a total existing floorspace of 8825 sq m.

Harvest has been in dialogue with Wiltshire Council, its predecessor, Salisbury District Council and Salisbury Vision since the purchase of the centre regarding the potential for the redevelopment of the Maltings and adjoining Central Car Park Site (MCCP) given the site's status in the adopted development plan and emerging LDF.

In February 2009, Montagu Evans appeared on behalf of Harvest at the planning inquiry into the proposed additional retail floorspace at Salisbury Retail Park (SRP), London Road. Harvest's evidence centred upon the prejudicial effect of the retail warehouse proposals on the future development of the MCCP site. MCCP is the sole major city centre retail led scheme for Salisbury, as is set out clearly in the Salisbury Vision. Salisbury has no other sites with the potential for a major retail led scheme providing large floorplate premises, suitable for national multiple occupiers.

In addition to this, almost all the retailers which the Appellant was targeting for the appeal scheme could potentially be accommodated within the MCCP scheme. Therefore, there was clearly direct competition for tenants between the two sites. An open A1 consent at SRP would have meant that other retailers in the same sector would be less likely to want to locate in Salisbury city centre because of the competition provided by the availability of stores on the appeal site.

The Inspector, in issuing her decision in April 2009, allowed the appeal and permitted the development of 8,361 sq m of retail warehouse floorspace with a further 4,181 sq m of retail floorspace at mezzanine level. However, this permission was subject to a restriction to allow bulky goods retail only and a restriction on the minimum size of the units. The reason for this was that the Inspector agreed that the appeal scheme would harm Salisbury City Centre by damaging the prospects for the MCCP site which the Council identifies as a vital element in protecting and enhancing Salisbury's role as a sub-regional shopping centre. She also

considered that the proposals did not accord with Policy DP6 of the Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan or with the advice in PPS6.

Matter 10, Formal Policy 7 – Retail

Question 10.1

Flexibility

Is Core Policy 7 too restrictive as to the form of development that will take place at Maltings/Central car park?

Harvest continues to welcome strongly the allocation of the Maltings/Central Car Park site for a retail-led mixed use development in Core Policy 7. The redevelopment of the site is essential to securing the future of Salisbury as a strong retail centre fulfilling its identified role in the retail hierarchy.

The precise form of development that will be delivered on the MCCP has yet to be finalised and scheme designs have not yet been fixed. This cannot be done until Wiltshire Council clarifies with certainty and with a fixed timetable, the way it wishes to deliver the redevelopment of the MCCP site in partnership with key landowners such as Harvest. Representations on the 'Proposed Submission Document' submitted on behalf of Harvest (see **Appendix 1**) highlighted the following points in relation to the specific wording of Core Policy 7:

1. While the total retail floorspace is likely to be around 40,000 sq m GEA, this should not be a prescriptive figure;
2. There is likely to be a department store, but it would be more appropriate to refer to an anchor retailer given retailers' changing requirements;
3. Research has shown that the existing Sainsbury's foodstore is too small. The reference should be to: 'Convenience floorspace in a large new foodstore increasing the floorspace currently provided on the site'
4. Harvest's research demonstrates that residential cannot be provided above the new retail floorspace because of the city's height limit. Therefore, the policy should clarify that residential is likely to be provided east of the River Avon. Harvest is not aware of a detailed evidence base which shows how 200 dwellings can be provided. In these circumstances, Harvest requests clarification that the primary purpose of the allocation (which is the delivery of additional retail floorspace as well as maintaining and enhancing the quality of car parking) is differentiated from residential uses which may be provided consistent with the wording of Appendix A.
5. The same issue applies to office uses. The delivery of retail and parking will be a challenge given the nature of the site. It is likely that there will be a small element of offices which will be lost as a consequence of the redevelopment. It may not be feasible or viable to re-provide on site.
6. The use of the wording 'Leisure uses' is unclear. Harvest would expect that there would be good quality catering on the site. Given the height restriction, there is no certainty that a cinema/multiplex use could be delivered for example. 15% is a prescriptive limit and should be removed.
7. The delivery of a new park will affect the quantum of residential that can be delivered

3rd paragraph, suggested rewording:

"There is potential for a total of approximately 40,000 sq m of retail floorspace (gross external area) although this will be determined by the extent of redevelopment of existing floorspace which will comprise of the following use"

1st bullet: change "a department" for "an anchor"

2nd bullet, suggested rewording:

"Convenience floorspace in a large new foodstore increasing the floorspace currently provided on the site."

3rd bullet, delete and replace with new suggested bullet:
"Potentially residential uses"

4th bullet, delete

5th bullet, delete and replace with new suggested rewording:
"Catering uses"

Whilst Harvest would be content with the adoption of Core Policy 7 with the above amendments, it would be preferable if the policy was less prescriptive. This would provide flexibility and take account of the need to balance the level of demolition, the extent of the site and in particular the viability of the scheme when finalising the development proposals. In the current market, it is counter productive to be too prescriptive because if there is significant variance from the aspirations of an over detailed policy, there is a risk that the allocation has to be revisited later in the form of a further Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), or a future application scheme has to be considered on its own merits weighing the significance of the differences compared with the allocation.

It is important that any amendment to the wording of Core Policy 7 emphasises the importance of the redevelopment of the MCCP site in bringing forward a retail-led mixed-use development capable of delivering the identified level of retail redevelopment to ensure the enhanced vitality, viability and competitiveness of Salisbury city centre.

Question 10.1a

Retail Evidence Base

Is the approach an assumption used to inform the study's findings on retail capacity appropriate? Have the findings been appropriately presented?

We are aware that there are a number of retail documents which have informed the Core Strategy. These include the following:

- Salisbury Retail and Leisure Needs Study (October 2006)
- The Retail Topic Paper (June 2007 and updated August 2009)
- The Addendum to Retail Topic Paper (June 2008)
- An Addendum 2 to the Retail Topic Paper (July 2009)

The retail study was prepared by GVA Grimley. The recently-published PPS4 highlights the important role that an up to date and sound evidence base played in planning positively for town centre uses. This is reflected in Policy EC1 which states that the evidence base should be used to identify deficiencies in the provision of local convenience shopping and other facilities. They should also be used to assess the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new town centre development. Harvest does not intend to comment on the specific detail of the retail strategy or updates and the detailed approach adopted. It is for the Council to ensure that the retail evidence base addresses all of the issues raised by PPS4 and is robust as possible. Any revised assessment or updates should also take into account of the latest lower expenditure per capita growth rates provided by Expedia and Map Info which are likely to reduce rather than increase retail need estimates.

Question 10.2

Timing

When is it anticipated that the development at Maltings/Central car park will take place? Is there a reasonable prospect of this occurring?

The Maltings site is currently allocated in the adopted local plan for retail use including provision for the redevelopment and enlargement of the existing Sainsbury's foodstore. The site also has an adopted planning brief from June 2001 in place. Issues concerning suitability and viability were considered in full as part of the

London Road planning appeal referred to above where Montagu Evans presented evidence on behalf of Harvest.

It is clear that the Sainsbury's foodstore has an important role to play, not only as one of the principal attractions and as a key facility in the town centre but also in terms of how it shapes options for the redevelopment of the site overall. The future of this foodstore is an important consideration generally and particularly as part of any redevelopment scheme which may come forward. As part of the evidence to the London Road inquiry, Montagu Evans provided a detailed programme and timetable for the potential redevelopment at the MCCP site based upon the information available at that time. This timetable envisaged that the development would be open and trading by December 2013. Indeed the Inspector concluded the following statement regarding timing for delivery:

'On the balance of all the evidence on availability, I conclude that there are reasonable grounds for expecting MCCP to come forward well before the Appellants suggested opening date in 2017 -2019. If the opening date were to slip beyond Harvest's prediction to 2014 (the SV expected date) or 2015, this would still seem to be reasonable availability, given the size of the intended scheme and its importance for Salisbury, and this appears to be achievable' (Para 21, page 6 Inspectors report)

This statement makes it clear that the new provision of other sites prior to the development of the MCCP site would not be acceptable until the site is delivered. Harvest considers that the development opportunity which the MCCP site represents is deliverable. The Council has undertaken its own development feasibility study which was prepared for the then Salisbury District Council it by Alder King in July 2008. A revised timetable produced by Wiltshire Council suggests that the implementation team and appointment of legal and commercial advisors will be completed by April 2010 and the scheme will start on site by early 2013. Whilst this presents a slight delay from the programme which was identified at the inquiry in February 2009, it nevertheless continues to demonstrate the Council's commitment to the redevelopment of this important strategic site within the city centre. The delay can be attributed directly to the early stages identified in the Council's evidence not taking place after the inquiry in 2009 as assumed at the time.

Overall, it is important that the strategic objectives for redevelopment of the site are recognised and that the scheme can integrate fully with the existing and surrounding town centre land uses. Importantly, the Inspector at the London Road inquiry concluded that a reasonable period of time should be allowed for the MCCP site to be made available identified as 2014/2015 or potentially beyond. It is therefore essential that the Council continues to work towards these objectives and securing the redevelopment of the MCCP site as a strategic allocation within the Core Strategy as the preferred location for convenience and comparison shopping needs within current plan period.

Question 10.3

Choice of Sites

Can the need for retail floorspace be met solely at the Maltings/Central car park?

The evidence base supporting the emerging LDF and the Inspector's decision from the SRP Inquiry show a clear and pressing need for additional comparison retailing floorspace in Salisbury. It has been concluded that the MCCP site can be regarded as being available and suitable to accommodate the identified need and Harvest continues to pursue the redevelopment of this site. It is therefore appropriate that this Core Strategy considers the MCCP site as a strategic allocation.

PPS4 Policy 4.15 outlines how local planning authorities should evaluate the options to accommodate the need for additional retail floorspace. This recommends that the option that secures the maximum investment, contributes to an effective network and hierarchy of centres, is sequentially preferable and accessible and would sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of different centres should be given the most weight. The evidence base concludes that the MCCP site fulfils these criteria.

The Inspector noted that the MCCP site may not be an appropriate location to meet the needs of bulky durable goods retailers and, as a consequence, the SRP was granted consent on appeal for circa 8,361 sq m of retail floorspace at ground floor level and 4,181 sq m of retail floorspace at mezzanine level. The type of goods to be sold from this floorspace was limited by condition to certain bulky durable goods only.

The combination of the MCCP strategic allocation and the extant consent for bulky goods at SRP do provide for a range and choice of sites which will meet Salisbury's identified quantitative and qualitative needs.

It is also important to note that the Core Strategy does not preclude additional proposals involving retail or other town centre uses coming forward on opportunity sites within the city centre, or in alternative locations that are in accordance with the relevant tests set out in PPS4. For example the currently vacant former Woolworths unit falls within this category. The allocation of out of centre sites would prevent the assessment of more appropriate sequentially preferable sites, and would perversely safeguard such out-of-centre sites to the detriment of sites more compliant with PPS4.

Does the allocation of Maltings/Central car park preclude the development of other retail proposals in appropriate locations which satisfy the objective of PPS4?

The principle of siting retail development within or close to town centres is clearly endorsed within the new PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) which states that Local Planning Authorities should proactively plan to promote competitive town centre environments and provide consumer choice by, amongst other things, identifying sites in the centre, or on the edge of centre, capable of accommodating larger format developments where a need for such development has been identified.

Any significant edge or out-of-town centre development should be resisted by the Council in accordance with PPS4 as it is likely to result in Salisbury city centre suffering adverse impacts. The city centre faces a crucial period where it will need to consolidate its role in the retail hierarchy and attract key national retailers to the city. Harvest will look to protect its existing asset, subject to the Council's decisions and deliver redevelopment of the MCCP site if the emerging Core Strategy is sufficiently robust to ensure that such major investment is not prejudiced by opportunistic accommodation of key retailers on retail parks outside the city centre.

Nothing in the Core Strategy precludes the development of other retail proposals in appropriate locations that are compliant with PPS4.

Question 10.4

Salisbury Retail Park

Why is the site at London Road, Salisbury (Salisbury Retail Park) not treated as saved Local Plan allocation?

PPS4 requires that development plans *inter alia* identify a range of sites to facilitate economic development and encourages local planning authorities to rely on a responsive, flexible development plan.

PPS4 also provides clear guidance requiring that new retail developments in general should support the Government's objectives of sustaining and enhancing existing centres and should be in accordance with the strategy for retail development set out in the development plan. The relevant supporting guidance at Para. EC17.1 states that planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre, planning permission should be refused where:

'There is clear evidence that the proposal is likely to lead to significant adverse impacts in terms of any one of impacts set out in policies EC10.2 and 16.1 (the impact assessment), taking account of the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments.'

Consideration is therefore required as to whether any proposal would result in adverse impacts relating to carbon dioxide emissions, accessibility and the impact on economic and physical regeneration in the area. Additional considerations that should be taken into account in assessing the effect of proposed developments on centres include the impact of any proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre, the impact of the proposals on town centre vitality and viability and, should the proposal be for retail or leisure use, the impact of the proposal on in-centre trade/turnover should be considered.

SRP is in an out of centre location which is not characterised by retail uses. Despite this, the site has both an extant consent that has been implemented and a consent recently granted at appeal for significant quantum of bulky durable goods retailing. The restriction on the use of the floorspace was a considered approach by the Inspector to protect Salisbury city centre. The Inspector concludes in paragraph 30 of the appeal decision that an open A1 scheme at SRP would *'have an unacceptable impact on Salisbury city centre.'*

It is therefore entirely appropriate, and in full compliance with PPS4, that SRP is no longer a strategic allocation. It has been available for a number of years to accommodate bulky goods retailing and the implementation of the extant permission safeguards this.

Any future application for bulky goods retailing would treat these consents as material considerations. An allocation of SRP would negate the future need to undertake a sequential approach to site selection and this would only have a detrimental effect on MCCP and the City Centre as a whole. An allocation would also mean that any proposal in a more appropriate location (such as on the edge of the city centre) would have to consider the potential impact on SRP under Policy EC16.1C. This can not be the intention of PPS4 and would safeguard SRP over and above any other out of centre retail warehouse proposals.

We trust you have all the necessary information you require, and should the Inspector require clarification on any of the points raised, please contact Julian Stephenson of this office in the first instance.

Yours sincerely



Montagu Evans LLP

APPENDIX 1
SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT
REPRESENTATIONS BY THE HARVEST PARTNERSHIP

- City of London
- Glasgow
- Edinburgh



JNS/CLS/PD7195
email: Julian.Stephenson@montagu-evans.co.uk

30 September 2009

Planning Office
Spatial Planning Team South
Wiltshire Council
61 Wyndham Road
Salisbury
SP2 7NN

FAO: Mr James Sutton

CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Clarges House
6-12 Clarges Street
London W1J 8HB
Tel: 020 7493 4002
Fax: 020 7312 7548
www.montagu-evans.co.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL: SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT REPRESENTATIONS BY THE HARVEST PARTNERSHIP

We write on behalf of our client, the Harvest Partnership, to submit their representations on the Core Strategy Proposed Submission document. This follows the representations submitted to Salisbury District Council on the Core Strategy Preferred Options in October 2008. The Harvest Partnership's representations are set out on the attached sheets under the relevant paragraph or policy number.

As the Council will be aware, Montagu Evans has been appointed as planning consultants by the Harvest Partnership to advise on the future redevelopment for the Maltings and Central Car Park site. The partnership's representations are concerned with the whole strategy as set out in the Core Strategy, but focus on issues pertinent to the Maltings and Central Car Park site.

We trust these representations will be of assistance in your preparation of the Core Strategy. In the meantime we look forward to your acknowledgement and response to these representations in due course. Should you have any queries please contact Julian Stephenson at the above email address or on 020 7312 7537.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Montagu Evans LLP".

MONTAGU EVANS LLP

Enc.

Ref:
(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Please return to Wiltshire Council, by 5pm on Wednesday 30th September 2009

By post to: Planning Office, Spatial Planning South Team, 61 Wyndham Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP2 7NN or

By e-mail to: james.sutton@wiltshire.gov.uk

By fax to: 01722 434 247

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

Title	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="MR"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="JULIAN"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="STEPHENSON"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="PARTNER"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="THE HARVEST PARTNERSHIP"/>	<input type="text" value="MONTAGU EVANS LLP"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="6-12 CLARGES STREET"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="LONDON"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="W1J 8HB"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="020 7312 7537"/>
E-mail Address (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="julian.stephenson@montagu-evans.co.uk"/>

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : **THE HARVEST PARTNERSHIP C/O MONTAGU EVANS LLP**

3. To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the DPD is

4.(1) Legally compliant Yes No

4.(2) Sound Yes No

*If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.*

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is not

(1) Justified

(2) Effective

(3) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD please also use this box to set out your comments.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Julie Steph

Date:

30/9/09

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT – JULY 2009

REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE HARVEST PARTNERSHIP

3.4(c) *Meeting Regeneration Needs*

Comment – general advice

The Harvest Partnership supports The Salisbury Vision's identification of the redevelopment of the Central Car Park/Maltings as being essential to securing the future of Salisbury as a retail centre.

3.6 **Weaknesses in the arts, entertainment, cultural and leisure sector**

Agree – general advice.

There is a limited supply of good quality cafes and restaurants in the city centre. The riverside location of the Central Car Park/Maltings site lends itself to such uses.

3.7 **The challenges of providing retail choice in South Wiltshire**

Agree – general advice.

There is a limited supply of good quality cafes and restaurants in the city centre. The riverside location of the Central Car Park/Maltings site lends itself to such uses.

3.7(a) *Salisbury*

Comment – general advice

The Harvest Partnership's research is that the principal omission in terms of retail provision is large stores capable of accommodating multiple retailers' requirements. This applies principally to retailers which cannot be accommodated in the existing part of the city centre, but also retailers already represented but in undersize units. Retailing is one of the fastest changing parts of the property sector. While it is likely that the development of the Maltings/Central Car Park will include a department store, it would be more appropriate to refer to an 'anchor' store to reflect the changing format and attraction of large stores in new retail developments.

3.8(a) *Pressures on landscape*

Comment – general advice

"Principle" should read "principal".

4.2 **Strategic Objective 1**

Desired outcomes:

first bullet point:

Comment – general advice

The support for new development predominantly around Salisbury is consistent with role identified for Salisbury in the RSS.

4.3 **Strategic Objective 3**

Desired outcomes:

fifth bullet point:

Endorse. **But** this should be an earlier priority consistent with paragraph 5.46(c) which states that this should commence in the 'short term'.

4.6 **Strategic Objective 5:**
Headline performance indicator:

Object:

While it is always an objective to ensure that all statutory consultees do not object to applications, this is not always possible because of the complexity of large mixed use projects. Therefore we do not consider the 'nil' target is realistic. In South Wiltshire, there is evidence of Officers' recommendations being overturned by Members which leads to planning permissions being granted contrary to Officers recommendations.

4.7 **Strategic Objective 6:**
Desired outcomes:
first bullet point:

Endorse. **But** this should be an earlier priority consistent with paragraph 5.46(c) which states that this should commence in the 'short term'.

4.8 **Strategic Objective 7:**
1st paragraph, 2nd sentence.

Amend as follows:

"This strategy requires the use of planning obligations to secure those works *or direct implementation* seen as essential to offset the potential impact of a development."

Headline performance indicator:

Comment – general advice

Certain developments which deliver wider planning benefits may not be able to deliver major changes in infrastructure if this is not viable. In these circumstances, the policies should reflect that direct provision of infrastructure by the public sector may be required because of the wider planning benefits involved.

5.3 *A - Salisbury.*

Comment – general advice

There should be recognition of the role Salisbury plays as a shopping centre serving not just South Wiltshire but also the wider area extending beyond the County boundary including south western Hampshire and eastern Dorset.

5.12 Endorse – general advice.

There is currently considerable outflow of comparison shopping expenditure both to other towns and retail warehouses and also at a local level to out of centre foodstores in terms of convenience goods expenditure.

5.17 **Core Policy 1 – The Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth in south Wiltshire**

Endorse – general advice.

5.22 **Core Policy 2 – Strategic Allocations**

Object – unsound

The Harvest Partnership has undertaken a detailed analysis of the Central Car Park site, in terms of development capacity and the '40 foot rule' (now covered by Core Policy 8: Salisbury Skyline). It is not practicable or deliverable to place residential above retail on this site otherwise the 40 foot rule in

Core Policy 8 will be breached. The only part of the site where residential may be appropriately delivered is east of the River Avon. There is no evidence base to calculate how many units can be delivered on this part of the site.

As the Central Car Park is the only large site capable of accommodating retail development in Salisbury City Centre, the policy should recognise that delivery of residential units on the site should be a secondary objective to the primary objective of the retail allocation combined with the site's role as the principal car park for the city centre. This primary role is reflected in the objectives for the development in Appendix A – Land at the Maltings and Central Car Park, where the objective for the site 's 'retail led'.

In these circumstances the reference to 200 units should be deleted, but the objective to include residential uses can remain subject to making it clear that this shall not be delivered above the retail floorspace because it would be in conflict with the 40 foot rule. These representations should be read in conjunction with Harvest's representations on Appendix A and Core Policy 2.

Map 3b – Strategic Site Allocations in Salisbury

Comment – general advice

As an allocated site, the whole of the Central Car Park site should be identified as part of the town (city) centre for the purposes of PPS6.

5.23 The Strategic importance of the sites (b)Regeneration

Endorse – general advice

Core Policy 3 – Meeting Local Needs for Affordable Housing

Object - soundness

This policy does not reflect the circumstances of mixed use developments where residential is only one component of a mixed use development and the viability of delivering other uses is also relevant. The level of affordable housing must be considered in light of overall scheme viability not just the residential component in isolation.

Rewording - sixth bullet:

"The provision of affordable housing will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis taking into account the viability of the development, the mix of affordable housing proposed and the delivery of the other planning benefits and the availability of any additional public subsidy....."

Core Policy 5 – Employment Land

General advice:

With the Maltings/Central Car Park, there may be the loss of existing employment uses to facilitate the retail-led development of the sites including maintaining sufficient car parking to serve the city centre.

Suggested rewording:

"ii)..... it is replaced with employment land or similar size elsewhere in that settlement or the loss of that employment land allows the delivery of a major site allocation for other uses"

6.4 Object – general advice

Salisbury is identified to enhance its place as a retail centre; otherwise the Council would not be allocating 40,000 sq m of retail floorspace on the Central Car Park/Maltings site.

Suggested rewording. Last sentence:

"Steps also need to be taken to ensure that Salisbury can maintain and enhance its place as an important retail centre"

6.6 Proposed change of wording – general advice

Retailing is one of the fastest changing parts of the property sector. While it is likely that the development of the Maltings/Central Car Park will include a department store, it would be more appropriate to refer to an 'anchor' store to reflect the changing format and attraction of large stores in new retail developments.

3rd sentence. Replace "department" with "anchor"

6.10 Object – soundness - not justified

Table:

The Harvest Partnership has undertaken a detailed analysis of the Central Car Park site, in terms of development capacity and the '40 foot rule' embodied in Core Policy 8: Salisbury Skyline. It is not practicable or deliverable to place residential above retail on this site otherwise the 40 foot rule will be breached. The only part of the site where residential may be appropriately delivered is east of the River Avon.

There is no evidence base to calculate how many units can be delivered on this part of the site. As the Central Car Park is the only large site capable of accommodating retail development in Salisbury City Centre, the policy should recognise that delivery of residential units on the site should be a secondary objective to the primary objective of the retail allocation combined with the site's role as the principal car park for the city centre.

In these circumstances the reference to 200 units should be deleted, but the objective to include residential uses can remain subject to making it clear that this shall not be delivered above the retail floorspace because it would be in conflict with the 40 foot rule. These representations should be read in conjunction with Harvest's representations on Appendix A and Core Policy 2.

6.21 3rd sentence.

Suggested rewording –general advice:

"There are also a number of key attractors missing, including department and other anchor stores and higher order and mainstream retailers....."

6.22 3rd sentence.

Suggested rewording –general advice:

"While Salisbury will never compete on level terms with the major conurbations of the south coast....."

6.23 Suggested rewording –general advice:

Change "department" for "anchor"

6.24 Suggested additional text – general advice:

"It should be noted that these capacity figures do not take account of the opportunity to clawback expenditure from competing centres and out of centre stores. Therefore, these figures should not be treated as maximums floorspace figures for city centre development."

6.25 3rd sentence.

Suggested rewording: soundness – not justified

"It can incorporate elements of residential, office and leisure uses subject to the results of further design development. The site shall form an extension to the primary shopping area (in line with PPS6)."

6.26 General advice

Paragraph 6.26 does not recognise that there is a greater threat from the development of further out of centre retail floorspace around Salisbury than the development of the Maltings/Central Car Park. Specialist retailers rely on spin-off trade from major town and city centre attractions. The text should be amended accordingly.

Core Policy 7 – Maltings/Central Car Park

Object – soundness and general advice

The Harvest Partnership welcomes the clarification provided by Core Policy 7. However, the precise form of the development that will be delivered has not yet been determined and is highly dependent on the level of demolition, the extent of the site and in particular the viability of the scheme. In particular the Harvest Partnership wishes to highlight the following points:

- 1) While the total retail floorspace is likely to be around 40,000 sq m GEA, this should not be a prescriptive figure;
- 2) There is likely to be a department store, but it would be more appropriate to refer to an anchor retailer given retailers' changing requirements;
- 3) Research has shown that the existing Sainsbury's foodstore is too small. The reference should be to: 'Convenience floorspace in a large new foodstore increasing the floorspace currently provided on the site'
- 4) Harvest's research demonstrates that residential cannot be provided above the new retail floorspace because of the city's height limit. Therefore, the policy should clarify that residential is likely to be provided east of the River Avon.

Harvest is not aware of a detailed evidence base which shows how 200 dwellings can be provided. In these circumstances, Harvest requests clarification that the primary purpose of the allocation (which is the delivery of additional retail floorspace as well as maintaining and enhancing the quality of car parking) is differentiated from residential uses which may be provided consistent with the wording of Appendix A.

- 5) The same issue applies to office uses. The delivery of retail and parking will be a challenge given the nature of the site. It is likely that there will be a small element of offices which will be lost as a consequence of the redevelopment. It may not be feasible or viable to re-provide on site.
- 6) The use of the wording 'Leisure uses' is unclear. Harvest would expect that there would be good quality catering on the site. Given the height restriction, there is no certainty that a cinema/multiplex use could be delivered for example. 15% is a prescriptive limit and should be removed.
- 7) The delivery of a new park will affect the quantum of residential that can be delivered

3rd paragraph, suggested rewording:

"There is potential for a total of approximately 40,000 sq m of retail floorspace (gross external area) although this will be determined by the extent of redevelopment of existing floorspace which will comprise of the following use"

1st bullet: change "a department" for "an anchor"

2nd bullet, suggested rewording:

"Convenience floorspace in a large new foodstore increasing the floorspace currently provided on the site."

3rd bullet, delete and replace with new suggested bullet:

"Potentially residential uses"

4th bullet, delete

5th bullet, delete and replace with new suggested rewording:

"Catering uses"

6.27 *Nurturing and protecting Salisbury city centre*

While Harvest welcomes the Plan's recognition of the linkage between the Maltings/Central Car Park redevelopment and the large number of applications for edge/out of centre floorspace, the issue is as much one of the impact of trade diversion and prejudice to investment based on the loss of retailers to edge/out of centre floorspace which might otherwise have been accommodated on the Maltings/Central Car Park site. Furthermore, the priority given to the delivery of the Maltings/Central Car Park sites means that the paragraph should reflect the clear conflict with the sequential approach.

The Harvest Partnership recommends that the remainder of this paragraph beginning with the wording: 'If any additional retail floorspace' is redrafted completely to reflect these comments. There should be a presumption against such edge or out of centre floorspace unless it can be demonstrated that the Maltings/Central Car Park cannot be delivered. Furthermore, the existing edge and out of centre floorspace should not be allocated as retail sites because of the implications in terms of the PPS6 tests.

Fig 4 Housing Trajectory – Salisbury

The Harvest Partnership has undertaken a detailed analysis of the Central Car Park site, in terms of development capacity and the '40 foot rule' embodied in Core Policy 8: Salisbury Skyline. It is not practicable or deliverable to place residential above retail on this site otherwise the 40 foot rule will be breached. The only part of the site where residential may be appropriately delivered is east of the River Avon.

There is no evidence base to calculate how many units can be delivered on this part of the site. As the Central Car Park is the only large site capable of accommodating retail development in Salisbury City Centre, the policy should recognise that delivery of residential units on the site should be a secondary objective to the primary objective of the retail allocation combined with the site's role as the principal car park for the city centre.

In these circumstances the reference to 200 units should be deleted, but the objective to include residential uses can remain subject to making it clear that this shall not be delivered above the retail floorspace because it would be in conflict with the 40 foot rule. These representations should be read in conjunction with Harvest's representations on Appendix A and Core Policy 2.

6.30(a) *Transportation:* 5th bullet point:

Comment: general advice and Objection - soundness

The Harvest Partnership supports the parking strategy which recognises the change in the number of spaces at the Central Car Park. Given that the primary objective of the redevelopment of the site is retail-led regeneration (as recognised in Appendix A), careful consideration needs to be given to the provision of traffic generating uses such as residential which also generates its own parking requirements. The Harvest Partnership recommends that the parking requirements of the city and the redevelopment of Maltings/Central Car Park needs to be considered holistically including whether the parking requirements of residential conflict with the shopping needs of the city given the constraints of the site. The paragraph therefore fails the test of soundness on the basis of the absence of an evidence base to demonstrate that all the uses proposed on the site can be accommodated and provided with sufficient parking taking account of the wider role of the Central Car Park for city centre parking.

Core Policy 8 Salisbury Skyline

Comment - general advice:

The Harvest welcomes the changes made to the Skyline policy from the proposals in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. However, in terms of general advice, consistent with Harvest's previous representations, there should be specific cross-reference to sites within the city where the 'exceptional circumstances' apply. Harvest requests that there should be a cross-reference to Core Policy 7.

13.1 Managing Delivery of the Strategic Site Allocations:

Table:

Object – soundness – not effective

At present there is no agreed process for the delivery of the Maltings/Central Car Park. It is essential that Wiltshire Council treats the site as a priority as there is also no timetable for selection of a partner which is the key to the delivery programme. As one of two principal land owners on the site subject to Core Policy 7, the Harvest Partnership is committed to working with Wiltshire Council. Therefore summary table fails the soundness test as it is not effective.

13.3 Next Steps and further Local development Framework Documents

Table:

Object – soundness – not effective

The Harvest Partnership has undertaken a detailed evaluation of the development potential of the Central Car Park/Maltings site. Until there is a decision taken on the process for and timetable for the selection of a development partner, it would seem that a review of the existing planning Brief would be premature. Therefore the delivery vehicle is not effective and therefore not sound.

In terms of general advice, Harvest very much supports the principle of reviewing the existing Brief. This needs to be undertaken as a priority. However, it also highlights that the allocations in terms of quantum and use need to be investigated more thoroughly. Harvest's own research and analysis does not support the allocation of 200 homes and points to there not being a sound evidence base. Core Policy 8: Salisbury Skyline places a significant constraint on the density that can be delivered on the site and would rule out residential over retail. Therefore the proposed delivery of 200 residential units would be in conflict with the proposed allocation for retail.

APPENDIX A – Land at The Maltings and Central Car Park

Comment – general advice:

The Harvest Partnership welcomes the identification of the whole of Central Car Park as a city centre site. The town centre boundary for the purposes of PPS6 should include the site.

Objectives for the development

The Harvest Partnership also welcomes that the objective is to develop a retail-led mixed use regeneration scheme. The Central Car Park site is the only suitable site for major retail development in Salisbury city centre. Unlike sites allocated for other uses, there are no other alternative sites.

Object – soundness – not justified

Harvest objects to the site 'making a significant strategic contribution to meeting local housing needs'. This part of the allocation is unsound because unlike the retail allocation which is underpinned by the Salisbury DC Retail Study, there is no evidence base to support how 200 residential units can be delivered on the site without being in conflict with the retail-led regeneration of the site. It should be noted that the March 2008 Salisbury DC Draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identified capacity for only 70 homes. This is based upon the Gillespies study which was part of evidence base for the Salisbury Vision. There is no evidence base to show how 200 dwellings can be delivered without conflict with Core Policy 8: Skyline. The application of this policy rules out residential above retail. This means that residential could only be delivered to the east of the River Avon.

Similarly there is no evidence base to suggest how 'a range of office space' can be accommodated with all the other use requirements. The allocation is unsound on the same basis as the residential allocation.

Site Constraints

Object – soundness – not effective

Harvest disagrees with the statement about fragmented land ownership. The majority of the site west of the River Avon is in two main ownerships: Wiltshire Council and the Harvest Partnership.

Land uses and quanta of development

Comment – general advice

The wording 'department store format' should be replaced by the wording 'anchor store' as this is more readily reflects the role of large retailers fulfilling this function in retail schemes.

Object – soundness – not justified

The foodstore in any redevelopment would be unlikely to be larger than the existing Sainsbury's store which is acknowledged as being too small to serve its role as the main foodstore in Salisbury city centre. Harvest request that the wording is amended accordingly.

Object – soundness – not justified
Reference to 200 dwellings should be deleted. While residential uses may be delivered to the east of River Avon, there is no evidence to suggest that 200 could be delivered without being in conflict with other elements of the allocation. These representations should be read in conjunction with Harvest's representations on Core Policy 2.

Object – soundness – not justified

Office use should be deleted for the same reason as above.

Essential Infrastructure Requirements

It should be clear that education contributions will be dependent on the level of residential delivered.

Harvest has undertaken a desk top archaeological study of the site and there is no evidence to suggest that an intrusive survey should be undertaken prior to finalisation of the site design.

APPENDIX E – INTEGRATED DELIVERY PLAN,

Table – CP8/CP9 row:

Object – soundness – not effective

This is not a sound approach as it fails the effectiveness test. A development partner needs to be selected before any masterplan is undertaken otherwise the deliver programme set out elsewhere in the Core Strategy will not be met.

Table – Strategic Option 6 (Core Policy CP7), first row:

Object – soundness – not effective

Masterplanning can only take place when a decision has been undertaken on the development partner for Wiltshire Council to deliver the Central Car Park site. This decision is now with Wiltshire Council and in terms of the 'desired outcomes', this is a priority decision.

APPENDIX F – SCHEDULE OF CHANGES TO LOCAL PLAN MAPS, TABLE 1

Row 8.4

The whole of the Maltings/Central Car Park should be allocated under Core Policy 7 as well as being defined as part of the town centre.

APPENDIX H – HOUSING TREJECTORIES

Delivery of the Strategic Sites

Object – soundness – not justified

This should be removed as there is no evidence base to support those 200 dwellings can be delivered. The Harvest Partnership has undertaken a detailed analysis of the Central Car Park site, in terms of development capacity and the '40 foot rule' (now covered by Core Policy 8: Salisbury Skyline). It is not practicable or deliverable to place residential above retail on this site otherwise the 40 foot rule in Core Policy 8 will be breached. The only part of the site where residential may be appropriately delivered is east of the River Avon. There is no evidence base to calculate how many units can be delivered on this part of the site.

As the Central Car Park is the only large site capable of accommodating retail development in Salisbury City Centre, the policy should recognise that delivery of residential units on the site should be a secondary objective to the primary objective of the retail allocation combined with the site's role as the principal car park for the city centre. This primary role is reflected in the objectives for the development in Appendix A – Land at the Maltings and Central Car Park, where the objective for the site 's retail led'.

In these circumstances the reference to 200 units should be deleted, but the objective to include residential uses can remain subject to making it clear that this shall not be delivered above the retail floorspace because it would be in conflict with the 40 foot rule. These representations should be read in conjunction with Harvest's representations on Appendix A and Core Policy 2.

APPENDIX I – DELIVERY RISK ASSESSMENT

Row – Speculative planning applications for out of town retail, housing and employment

There have been a series of applications for edge and out of centre retail stores. There was an Inquiry into a retail warehouse proposal at London Road in 2009. Until a clear delivery strategy is agreed for the Central Car Park sites the risk is high.