



15.02.2010

Page 1 of 2

South Wiltshire Agenda 21

South Wiltshire Agenda 21 is a voluntary group working towards a sustainable future for South Wiltshire. Membership of the group includes 68 individuals and 40 organisations, including schools and businesses.

Matter 3. Core Policy 2. Distribution of Development –Strategic Allocations.

Question 3.2. Strategic Allocations –How and Why Selected? *What criteria were used in selecting the Strategic Allocations? Why were they selected and alternatives rejected? Are these sites in the most sustainable locations; do they respect local character and the local environment; do they have the best access to local services and employment; and are they otherwise suitable when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?*

South Wiltshire Agenda 21 remains concerned about the extent of the proposed growth in Salisbury and South Wiltshire. The reasons for our concern are as previously stated:

3.2.1. Impact on the River Avon SAC.

This aspect of the Core Strategy proposals for Salisbury is of particular concern because of the possible impact on the River Avon SAC and the Avon Valley SPA further downstream (Habitat Regulations Assessment July 2008. 4. Water Quality). Please see also under AWS/South Wiltshire Agenda 21/1205/5 Question 5.8.

3.2.2. Brown field/green field development.

Salisbury cannot comply with the target set in the RSS that at least 50% of new housing should be located on previously developed sites, in South Wiltshire the target is for only 34%. In view of this is it right to expect the area of South Wiltshire, with its protected landscape and river system, to take this level of new development?

3.2.3. Traffic implications.

3.2.3.1. The traffic implications of the strategic sites have not been given sufficient consideration with no detail of the type of employment likely to be allocated to each strategic site. This is important because the impact of businesses using HGVs is considerably greater than offices and some small firms with robust and well-implemented green travel plans. One of the main considerations at an early stage will be the relocation of Churchfields businesses to release this brown field site for a mixed-use development. The origin and destination figures for Churchfields, from a previous survey, indicated that only about 12% of vehicles came from south of the river. We would therefore like to see relocation of HGV generating businesses to sites on the north side of the city where use of the existing road links to the strategic road network via the A360 and A345 would have minimum impact on existing residential areas.

3.2.3.2. Locating this type of development south of the Netherhampton Road would increase congestion on the already busy Ring Road, Harnham Gyratory and the entirely residential Harnham Road.

3.2.3.3. The Wiltshire & Swindon draft Site Allocations DPD is currently out for public consultation but, because of the timing of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy examination, the transport implications of the chosen strategic and local sites have not been factored into the traffic modelling for the Core Strategy.

Question 3.3. Mixed Use and Self Containment. *For the most part the Strategic Allocations would be mixed use sites. What evidence is there that this would reduce the number of trips by car, promote self containment?*

3.3.1. Most mixed-use developments in this country are associated with urban regeneration and are located around key transport hubs, although there is a trend towards business parks located in suburbia on the edge of large cities.

3.3.2. We would strongly support mixed use, which includes housing, local shops, schools, doctors surgeries and sports facilities that would promote self containment for everyday needs. However there appears to be little evidence that, in a city the size of Salisbury mixed use developments, with sizeable employment sectors, would reduce the need to travel. There would be no guarantee that people would choose to live close to their work, in fact the reverse is often the case.

3.3.3. We fully support mixed residential and employment on the brown field sites of Churchfields, the Central Car Park and the UKLF site but would question whether the same criteria should be applied to some of the other suburban locations. The transport infrastructure requirements of residential and employment areas are likely to be very different, especially if the employment uses require HGV movements.

3.3.4. The location of employment sites must be designated according to their transport needs, such as links with the rail and /or strategic road network. They should then have good transport links to bring the workforce from residential areas using a network of footpaths, cycleways and bus services.