

MATTER 3. CORE POLICY 2. DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT – STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS.

Question 3.1. Strategic Allocations – Why Strategic? Core Policy 2 identifies nine Strategic Allocations which would provide a significant proportion of the housing land to be found in south Wiltshire and much of the employment land. These are Fugglestone Red, Hampton Park, Longhedge (Old Sarum), Churchfields & Engine Sheds, UKLF, South of Netherhampton Road, Central Car Park, Kings Gate Amesbury and the former Imerys Quarry. Are all of these sites truly strategic in the sense that they central to the achievement of the strategy (PPS12 paragraph 4.6)?

1. Whilst the Strategic Allocations identified in Core Policy 2 have the potential to provide for the scope of housing and employment targets in the draft RSS, the Inspector is correct in questioning their role in achieving the underlying strategy of the DPD. Core Strategies are not just about achieving housing and employment targets, they are about responding to local challenges in a positive and proactive manner.
2. In Matter 1 our Hearing Statement identifies the need for the CS to be flexible enough to handle contingencies and deal with changing circumstances which may arise through the uncertainty with the emerging RSS. In particular, we suggest that it may be appropriate to consider whether some sites could be appropriately left for the subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD.
3. Therefore, in turning to what type of site is “*truly strategic*” to the achievement of the CS, we suggest that sites such as the MCCP are integral to enhancing Salisbury’s role as a Strategically Significant City and addressing leakage of trade to competing centres such as Southampton and Bournemouth. For this reason, the CS must ensure that it provides the appropriate policy support to the MCCP such as in a Core Policy. However, it is not a site which needs to be a Strategic Allocation to address these challenges, as this makes it become too prescriptive.
4. However, it is imperative that such policy support does not provide additional, unnecessary obstacles to its delivery. Therefore, without the appropriate flexible wording, the Strategic Allocations could risk being ineffective to those seeking to deliver them.
5. PPS12 asserts that strategic sites within Core Strategies should be those sites “*considered central to achievement of the strategy and where investment requires a long lead in*” (4.7). Usually those projects which have civic value such as the redevelopment of the MCCP are those which will require a long lead in, and a highly focused effort to deliver.
6. The CS should therefore be concentrating on devising a delivery strategy to deal with the particular issues which have been identified of “*local importance*” (4.33) to South Wiltshire which require this approach. Whilst there are numerous references within the evidence base to the issues of

local importance and specific challenges facing South Wiltshire, these are ineffectively translated into the policy wording and associated text within the CS. Coincidentally, it is those matters which are central to the achievement of the strategy which need to be explicitly clear within the CS.

7. In Matter 1, we also raise with the Inspector the lack of policy emphasis given to Southampton Road. Whilst it is not a Strategic Allocation (and we do not suggest this), it is identified as a key project (and specific local challenge) within the Salisbury Vision. It is central to the achievement of the CS, and will require a long lead in of investment and application of considerable expertise, and should be given appropriate policy weight within the CS.

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?*

8. We welcome the views of the Council in discussing the criteria used in selecting the Strategic Allocations at the Examination.

As discussed in Question 3.1, we consider that the MCCP is not a site which needs to be a Strategic Allocation within the CS to ensure that it addresses the local retail challenges in Salisbury. A flexible Core Policy should be adopted which provides the appropriate framework to meet the local challenges, and which seek to enhance the role and function of Salisbury as a Strategically Significant Town within the South West of England.

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?*

9. We welcome comments and evidence from the Council in relation to this question at Examination.
10. In broad terms we accept that very large scale mixed use development can assist in the creation of linkages between different uses and can thereby create more vibrant and sustainable places. However, this should not override the benefits associated particularly with smaller scale, single use development schemes which, in conjunction with effective area planning, can create an efficient mix of users across an area and could adequately bring about reductions in the number of trips by cars and achieve wider sustainability benefits.
11. Therefore, it is not just Strategic Allocations with mixed uses that are the solution to more sustainable communities.