

MATTER 5. CORE POLICY 2. DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT – STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS

Question 5.1. Amount and Mix of Development. *Would the strategic allocations be capable of delivering the amount and mix of development proposed?*

1. The amount and mix of development proposed through Strategic Allocations overall seems reasonable based on the evidence base available. However, as discussed in other matters (in particular Matter 10) we hold concerns with regard to the mix of development proposed at the MCCP.
2. In particular, it is overly prescriptive in relation to the quantum and mix of retail floorspace at the MCCP. We therefore consider that it should not be a Strategic Allocation, but rather just be recognised within a Core Policy in a flexible manner.

Question 5.2. Frontloading. *The CS is based on the frontloading of housing and economic development. In other words the intention is that much of the proposed development would occur in the early years of the plan. What is the justification for this approach?*

3. No comment. We welcome the Councils views on this question.

Question 5.3. Rate of Development. *All of the strategic allocations have been selected because of their ability to deliver development in the early years of the plan. How many houses and how much employment land is it anticipated that each of the Strategic Allocations would yield per year? What evidence is there to suggest that these sites would be able to deliver development at this rate?*

4. As discussed within our Hearing Statement for Matter 10, we hold concerns about the timing of delivering the appropriate form of comparison led development on the MCCP site. We consider it is vital for the Council and retailers to hold confidence in the eventual re-emergence of market potential for a quality development, and the ever increasing need for it in the Salisbury catchment. Realism needs to be applied to the task in hand. The 200 residential units within the MCCP will not be deliverable in the early years of the Plan.

Question 5.4. Development Milestones and Phasing. *With the exception of the Central Car Park site the intention is that all of the strategic allocations will have been the subject of a planning application within 18 months of the adoption of the CS, that delivery will start within a further 12 months and that thereafter it would proceed in accordance with an agreed phasing plan. How reasonable is this and how feasible? Why is the Central Car Park not subject to such requirements when the housing trajectory appears to show it delivering housing from 2012/2013 onwards? Why is Churchfields the subject of such requirements when the CS acknowledges that it is a longer term project because of its complex nature?*

5. We welcome the Councils views in relation to the delivery of the Strategic Allocations, and await further evidence which supports them.
6. The Inspector helpfully picks up on the inconsistency with the housing trajectory and delivery of the MCCP. Policy CP7 seeks the provision of

“around 200 residential units” at the MCCP which the Housing Trajectories at Appendix 8 to the Core Strategy identify as being delivered during 2012-2016. This is too prescriptive given that 200 residential units will be undeliverable by the point envisaged (see our response to Question 10.2). Instead the policy should seek an aspiration for residential use.

Questions 5.5 and 5.6 Are there any insurmountable barriers to delivery of the Core Strategy in terms of highways and transportation and what measures are required?

Summary

7. The Salisbury Transport Strategy Options Assessment Report, published in January 2010, identifies a number of potential transport interventions, assesses the performance of these interventions against identified objectives and concludes that with the correct strategy Salisbury can meet the challenges of addressing future forecast growth in travel demand in a sustainable manner.
8. On this basis there are no insurmountable barriers, in terms of highways and transportation, to delivery of the Core Strategy. However, there needs to be more clarity with regard to the type of specific solutions required to respond to the local challenges in South Wiltshire, and the manner in which these can be funded.

The Salisbury Transport Strategy - Key proposals.

9. Wiltshire Council commissioned Atkins to prepare a transport strategy according to ‘objective led planning principles’ defining a set of initiatives for the Salisbury and Wilton area which respond to the additional transport demands resulting from planned growth in the area up until 2026. The report considers the performance of two options: ‘*the Established Approach*’ and ‘*the Radical Option*’. The *Established Approach* continues with the established local policy approach working within existing financial constraints; the *Radical Option* is a range of what are considered to be more intensive measures, requiring greater reliance on other sources of funding, particularly from developers.
10. Within the ‘*Established Approach*’ public transport provision to developments and other locations within the Salisbury urban area is maintained at least two buses per hour during the morning and evening peaks. Transport demand is managed by parking charges and the highway network is largely improved through the review of signal operation. This is alongside the continued implementation of Travel Plans for new developments and the ongoing promotion of walking and cycling:

11. The guiding feature of the *Radical Option* is *'to accommodate growth in the most sustainable manner possible whilst improving economic vitality'*¹.
12. The report states that it is essential to be able to accommodate growth whilst locking-in the benefits of improvements. The report then identifies interventions, including demand management, traffic management, road hierarchy, traffic restraint and route ambience enhancements, and network improvements.
13. The Options Assessment Report concludes that the above approach would enable Salisbury to meet the challenges of future growth in a sustainable manner. It also concludes that the approach is affordable within the expected envelope of total funding likely to be available through local sources providing funding is secured through an appropriate mechanism on new developments. The report also notes that none of the proposals require powers that are not already available to Wiltshire Council or rely on untested solutions.

Is the proposed Salisbury Transport Strategy 'Radical'?

14. In short No. The Strategy approach is fully in accordance with both National and Regional policy as set out in **Appendix A**. Hence, the term *'radical'* is inappropriate under the circumstances, and better regarded as the most *"sustainable"* approach.
15. In particular, the A36 Southampton Road is an example of how this sustainable approach could positively respond to implementing the aims and objectives of the Salisbury Vision.
16. With regards to the A36 Southampton Road, the Salisbury Vision identifies the *"frequent severe traffic congestion"* and unsightly visual appearance on its approaches into Salisbury. It identifies a number of objectives for Southampton Road with the following overarching rationale to *"improve the gateway into Salisbury from the east, complement the physical regeneration of the area and to encourage people to use Southampton Road by way of alternative modes of transport to the private car"*.
17. The Vision sets out potential projects and solutions to respond to the above objectives (See **Appendix B**). Indeed, the Transport Strategy identifies some of these broader objectives within the sustainable approach, but this is far from a detailed analysis to enable a deeper understanding of the cause of the problems to the A36, and how these can be overcome in the short-term.

¹ The Options Assessment report states that ***"This combines highway measures on key routes to ensure ease of movements for buses, HGVs and cars on these routes. To encourage sustainable travel, demand management is off-set by improved bus services and increased frequency park and ride services. A review of cycling and walking routes shall also ensure that sustainable journeys are also catered for through enhanced smarter choices."*** (Paragraph 5.3. Salisbury Transport Strategy. Options Assessment Report. January 2010)

18. As an example, our review of the current layout of Southampton Road between the Bourne Way and College roundabouts identifies that this link is a product of a now outdated design philosophy. The current layout fails to maximize efficiency and safety. All traffic accessing properties along Southampton Road is forced to access/egress by left turn only necessitating a u-turn at the end roundabouts to achieve a right turn. The resultant significant u-turning at the end roundabouts reduces capacity and increases movements in both directions on the link. In addition restricting traffic to a single lane with no ability to pass slow or stationary vehicles disrupts flow patterns and increases congestion.
19. To address these issues and provide a road layout which is more efficient, acknowledges the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and accommodates the forecast traffic flow the following improvements could be implemented as part of the overall strategy:
- Remove central barrier to create more road space and reintroduce right turn facilities. This, together with the reformatting of junctions and ped/cycle facilities, would improve overall efficiency and is consistent with current design philosophy of improving efficiency and safety by integrating rather than separating modes.
 - Reformat footpath/cycleway layout to improve usability. Dependant on the outcome of a detailed Non-Motorised User Audit (NMUA) the existing arrangement can be reformatted to improve safety and efficiency. Use of coloured surfaces may also improve usability.
 - Introduce signal control along the link both for side road access and crossing facilities for cycle and pedestrians. This would be consistent with the introduction of signals at the access to the new Peter's Finger Park and Ride site. The introduction of signalisation would create platooning providing opportunity for right turning at other accesses and junctions. It would also provide improved cross facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Generally provide a central 'turning' lane to allow right turn manoeuvres and the ability to pass stationary and slow vehicles.
20. An improvements scheme of this form will address the concerns expressed in both the Salisbury Vision and the Options Assessment report, delivering an improvement to Southampton Road which is fully consistent with the overall Transport strategy for Salisbury by:
- Removing u-turn movements at both the College and Bourne Way roundabouts therefore releasing additional capacity;
 - Increasing platooning of movements along the link creating opportunities for right turn movements into accesses;
 - Improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists;

- Improving the street scene with the removal of the unsightly barrier;
 - Increasing scope for bus priority measures along the link and at the College roundabout.
21. Therefore, whilst the Transport Strategy includes broad measures to improve the overall sustainable approach to transportation in South Wiltshire, it could be more effective if it acknowledges the more detailed solutions (such as the example above in Southampton Road) and provides a more robust framework to support development which can assist with the delivery of these improvements.
22. Essential to the delivery of such improvements is ensuring that there is, at least, an effective mechanism to seek contributions to provide them. The Options Assessment Report does not go into detail about how this will work, apart from referencing the possibility of introducing a 'Sustainable Transport Levy', and asserting that "*further details will be available in subsequent reports*" (Para 6.59). There are no available details at present, and it is essential that this information be available, clearly explained and detailed discussion and evidence on how it could be applied. This information needs to have been assessed and consulted on up front, and open to debate at the examination.
23. We therefore hold concerns with this approach and consider that it is important that the Transport Strategy ties particular development to identified transport improvements in accordance with Government Guidance wherever possible. This will ensure that opportunities to seek funding from larger schemes are linked to local infrastructure requirements and local challenges in South Wiltshire.

Question 5.7. Do any Key Strategic Elements of Infrastructure need to be in place before commencement of development? *The CS acknowledges that proposed development would need to be supported by the key strategic elements of infrastructure set out in Core Policy 2. However, the gist of paragraph 5.31 is that the implementation of all of the Strategic Allocations and the Saved Local Plan Allocations could start in the short term without awaiting any of the key strategic elements of infrastructure referred to in Core Policy 2. What is the evidence for this?*

24. No Comment. We welcome the Council's views on this question.

Question 5.8. Key Strategic Elements of Infrastructure. What, Who and When? *What measures are proposed to ensure that additional pressures on the sewerage network, particularly around Salisbury, be accommodated: that phosphate and pollution levels in local watercourses can be controlled (see also CP 20); that an adequate water supply can be provided to new developments; (See also CP 19); that the additional demand for emergency services, healthcare and school places be dealt with; and that important green infrastructure is provided or retained? Who would be responsible for financing and implementing these various measures and when would they be implemented?*

25. As discussed within our representations to the Submission Draft, we hold concerns that the CS fails to recognise the opportunities for the enhancement of the environment offered by new development, seeking only the protection of the local environment. In light of national planning policy (PPS9) and RSS policy (SD3) seeking the enhancement of the natural environment, the Core Strategy should take a proactive approach and give support to developments which seek to maximise environmental and public benefits.

26. By enhancing the quality of the natural environment and opening up public access as may be appropriate, a number of objectives would be supported; improving the quality of life for residents, the experience for visitors and the economic environment for businesses.

27. Promoting the enhancement of the local environment in new developments would therefore be an appropriate and effective strategy in all circumstances and would ensure the Core Strategy is in accordance with national policy. Similar to the proposal for a “country park” in the Hampton Park housing release, the Core Strategy should be proactively encouraging opportunities to enhance the green infrastructure across south Wiltshire. The identification of such positive enhancements should therefore have a key role in assessing development that may not form part of strategic housing or employment releases.

28. Furthermore, given the substantial flood risk issues within the District, the Core Strategy should be encouraging innovative flood mitigation and enhancement measures. In particular, developments which can promote innovation should be encouraged here.

APPENDIX A - Is the proposed Salisbury Transport Strategy 'Radical'?

National Transport policy changed significantly with the publication of the White Paper 'A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone' (DETR, 1998) and the *10 Year Plan* (DETR,2000). The primary emphasis shifted from the incremental expansion of the road network to meet forecast demand (i.e. a predict and provide strategy) towards one of focusing more on reducing the need to travel on roads, especially by commuters in private cars.

To achieve these aims the White Paper identified that better integration between land use and transport planning at national, regional and local levels would be required. Whereas previously, compliance with policy could be largely proven by demonstrating that operational performance of the adjacent road network would not be adversely affected, the White Paper recommended that a more balanced approach would be required. The policy set by the White Paper still remains in force and is reflected in the Department for Transport's objectives to:

- Sustain economic growth and improved productivity through reliable and efficient transport networks;
- Improve the environmental performance of transport
- Strengthen the safety and security of transport; and,
- Enhance access to jobs, services and social networks, including for the most disadvantaged.

To reflect the White Paper and associated advice the government updated national planning guidance principally through the publication of *Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport* (PPG13) in March 2001.

The objectives of PPG13 guidance, which is still current, are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level; to promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight; promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and reduce the need to travel, especially by car (*PPG13 para 4*). To achieve these objectives PPG13 promotes a number of initiatives including enhancements to public transport, demand management, promotion of walking and cycling initiatives and the design of new development so as to reduce the need to travel by car.

In parallel with PPG13 the Department of Environment produced Circular 4/2001 This has subsequently been replaced by DfT Circular 02/2007 which, together with the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment, was published in 2007. These documents have provided updated guidance on the appropriate transport strategies for new development to ensure that environmental sustainability is encouraged, the existing network is managed and residual impacts are mitigated.

Circular 02/2007 recognises that: "*It is Government transport policy, wherever possible, to look for alternatives to building new roads, by reducing the impact of road users on each other and the environment, improving road performance through better network management and making smarter journey choice easier*" (para 8) . The circular goes on to state (para 33) that "*Developers, working in partnership with*

local authorities, must submit plans for the implementation and maintenance of measures that will minimise the traffic generated by their development.. These will include measures to manage car use, particularly by single occupants. Examples of such techniques may include tailored provision of public transport, car sharing/pooling, parking control, and the encouragement of cycling and walking This guidance is reflected in the Highways Agency's response to the consultation on the Core Strategy in September 2009.

The Guidance on Transport Assessment sets out clear advice on reducing the need to travel, especially by car, through best possible use of existing transport infrastructure, demand management, and improvements to local public transport networks and walking and cycling facilities.

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West is fully in accordance with the guidance in PPG 13, DfT circular 02/2007 and the Guidance on Transport Assessment. Policy RT2 seeks to achieve a 'step change' in the prioritisation of sustainable transport measures at the main towns and cities (the SSCTs) promoting measures such as:

- *“better walking and cycling measures*
- *the promotion of more sustainable travel behaviour (e.g 'Smarter Choices')*
- *improved facilities for public transport*
- *new and expanded park-and-ride;*
- *improved management of road space including schemes to improve average bus speeds and high occupancy vehicle lanes;*
- *parking strategies including charging regimes;*
- *congestion charging/road pricing;”*

APPENDIX B - A36 SOUTHAMPTON ROAD CORRIDOR - SALISBURY VISION OBJECTIVES

- *Improve the A36 Southampton Road as an important gateway to the city making it attractive for commuters and tourists; this could include priority measures for buses and cyclists and high quality public transport stops.*
- *Carry out a feasibility study on measures to reduce congestion.*
- *Increase the local bus frequency for local commuters.*
- *Rationalise the number of access points on to Southampton Road from adjacent streets and access roads.*
- *De-clutter, where possible, areas of the public realm through the rationalisation of highway signage, barriers, bollards and other highway related items.*
- *Include high quality, simple and coordinated public realm elements such as boulevard planting, street furniture, lighting, paving and public art.*

With regards to walking and cycling, the Vision states that “*where possible implement a system of shared space with even surfaces for streets and footpaths and where signs, kerbs, railings, bollards and traffic lights are removed*”. In relation to Southampton Road, the Vision suggested the following projects:

- *Improve crossing facilities for pedestrians/cyclists and junction improvements along the A36 ring road.*
- *Provide or upgrade cycle routes along all major thoroughfares including Southampton Road, Exeter Street, Churchfields Road and Castle Street. These should link, where possible, with National Cycle routes passing through the city centre.*

On public transport in Southampton Road, the Vision identifies the need to provide a west to east public transport link from Churchfields stopping at key destinations within the city centre to Southampton Road. This includes a bus/pedestrian and cycle-only connection from Exeter Street through to Southampton Road.

The Vision incorporates a Traffic and Movement Strategy which includes the commissioning of a Salisbury and Wilton Transport Model. This has now been completed and provides the basis for the Options Assessment Report. That reports takes up the issues identified with regarding Southampton Road and notes that whilst there is a desire to achieve improvements to route ambience along Southampton Road, “*A review of carriageway width shows little scope for additional vehicle lanes (including bus lanes) without reducing or completely removing the shared footpath/cycle way on Southampton Road*”. It also notes that whilst there is a

desire to improve the College Roundabout “*An initial review of the junction reveals that little can be done to improve College Roundabout as it is required for u-turns*”.