

**MATTER 4. CORE POLICY 1. DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT – OTHER SOURCES OF LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT.**

**Question 4.1. Suitability of the Saved Local Plan Allocations.** *The CS relies on allocations saved from the Salisbury District Local Plan to provide some 1594 dwellings and 27.4 ha of employment land. Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?*

1. No comment other than in re-allocating previously allocated sites, the Council should be demonstrating why they are still suitable, based on up to date evidence. Whilst paragraph 5.46 of the CS states that “as assessment, including dialogue with landowners has been carried out to establish the likelihood of their coming forward”, this evidence does not appear to be available for scrutiny.
2. Therefore, these previous allocations should not unduly preclude the development of other sites which satisfy the underlying objectives of the CS.
3. The Salisbury Vision, which is given weight and recognition within the draft RSS, puts forward “vision projects” which respond to matters of local importance in South Wiltshire. However, the CS only identifies that some of these will be delivered in the short term (such as MCCP and Churchfields), and that others will “contribute in the region of 800 houses in the longer term” (paragraph 5.436(c)). Whilst we consider this matter in more detail at Question 4.3, it is important that the reallocation of previously allocated sites which have not come forward do not detract from the need to bring forward regenerative and maybe more locally relevant and better address sustainability issues.

**Question 4.2. Provenance and Suitability of Strategic Areas of Search.** *The CS refers to ‘strategic areas of search’ around Salisbury as having the potential to accommodate some 1000 dwellings and 15 ha of employment land. Where are these ‘strategic areas of search’? Why are their broad locations not shown on the key diagram? Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS? What is the basis of their selection as being potentially suitable for development?*

1. No comment.

**Question 4.3. Suitability of Salisbury Vision Sites.** *The CS refers to ‘Salisbury Vision’ sites as having the potential to accommodate some 800 houses in the longer term. Are these sites in suitable and sustainable locations when judged against the criteria used for site selection in the CS?*

Overview

1. Some of the Salisbury Vision sites which provide scope for housing are more aspirational and less suitable than others. Moreover, the SV is substantially led by commercial and retail initiatives, promoting employment and other opportunities often with housing being a relevant part of a mixed use incentive.

#### Statement

2. The provision of housing in some of these schemes may help to support the role played by major mixed use, in others it may help deliver wider initiatives. This should not place less emphasis on these projects which can assist the delivery of major infrastructure improvements. However, there are some initiatives where the contribution of proposed housing may not have been well considered.
3. Project 10 (The Eastern Gateway) envisages the provision of new housing, coupled with Project 16 (Southampton Road) to help bring about overall transport and visual improvements to this part of Salisbury. It is not clear what quantum of housing is envisaged within these projects at this stage (although the Retail Topic Paper suggests a circa 4ha site would be lost from retail use).
4. However, given the current issues with visual appearance, congestion and associated challenges along this corridor, it is unlikely that a residential-led scheme (as envisaged by the Salisbury Vision) will be able to bring about the step-change needed in this location.
5. This one example suggests it may be premature or inappropriate to assume that the Salisbury Vision will successfully implement the extent of housing envisaged within it. On the contrary, what is lacking is the clear steer and direction of how to deliver the major vision projects. Indeed, MCCP and Churchfields are given policy weight through being Strategic Allocations within the CS, but the Eastern Gateway and other major projects are not.
6. We note that the Salisbury Vision Steering Group made specific representations to the Submission CS in relation to this, stating that they "*note the absence of a solution to the Southampton Road (A36) problem which is identified in "Salisbury Vision" and which is of particular concern*".
7. Core Strategies relate to specific areas, and in particular the Salisbury Vision has emerged from area specific challenges which affect Salisbury. In particular, the underlying reasons for preparing the strategy were driven by something needed to be done to "*maintain its position as one of the south west's premier centres for business, tourism and retail*". (pg8).
8. The original work on the document was produced on the basis of four "*key areas*" that the Council identified to be a priority, including the

MCCP, Southampton Road, The Market Place/Guidehall Square and Churchfields Industrial Estate". Based on initial consultation, it was agreed that the "Step Change" option, which focused on major changes aimed at enhancing the City's environment, improving the overall shopping experience, providing additional jobs and housing, would be pursued and translated into a masterplan for Salisbury.

9. To help achieve the Vision, it developed three overall strategies being development, transport and movement, and public realm. The main priority of the development strategy of the Vision is to "*significantly improve the city's position as a shopping and business centre*" with the MCCP, Southampton Road and Churchfields Industrial Estate identified for "*major development*" (pg20). Therefore, to achieve the appropriate step-change required to enhance Salisbury's position, it is therefore these projects which the Council need to provide policy emphasis on within the CS.

**Question 4.5. Windfalls.** *Future windfalls are referred to in the CS as a having the potential to supply some 501 housing sites over the period 2020/21 -2025/26. What is the basis for this figure?*

1. No comment

**Question 4.6. Employment.** *The emerging RSS acknowledges that there are opportunities for some job growth at locations such as Amesbury but states that the key strategic aim is to extend and enhance Salisbury as an employment and retail centre. Porton Down, Boscombe Down and Solstice Park are all in the Amesbury area and are all allocated for employment in the Salisbury District Local Plan. However while the first two of these locations are treated as saved local plan sites the latter is not. Why is this?*

1. At the time the Submission Draft CS was submitted to the Secretary of State, Solstice Park was allocated as an employment site. However there were proposals by Tesco Stores Ltd seeking permission for retail (A1) uses on this site. Officers recommended refusal for a foodstore in this location, however it was called in and permission granted by the Secretary of State. Therefore, the site is now a commitment for retail use. It no longer requires to be treated as a saved Local Plan site.