



South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Matter 5

Core policy 2

Delivery of Development – Strategic Allocations

Ref: DJM/SH/NS/SWCS/M5

January 2010

Contents

Issues and Matters to be Considered	Page No.
Question 5.1. Amount and Mix of Development. Would the strategic allocations be capable of delivering the amount and mix of development proposed?	5
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?	6
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?	6
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?	9
Question 5.5. Transport. An Insurmountable Barrier? The CS states that that there are in, highways and transportation terms, no insurmountable barriers to delivery; that the transport network, with improvements, will be able to support the levels of growth over the plan period; and that it is unlikely that new road building will be required. What is the evidence to support these statements?	10
Question 5.6. Transport. What, Who and When? What are the highway and transportation measures, or range of potential measures, that would need to be put in place in order to ensure that the transport network would be able to support the Strategic Sites? In developing these sites can congestion and safety problems on the major transport corridors of the A303 and A36 be overcome, can pressure on the Salisbury ring road be accommodated and can meaningful alternative transport choices to the private car be provided? Who would be responsible for financing and implementing any measures that would be required and when would they be implemented?	11
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?	13
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?	14
Appendix 1 - Infrastructure	16

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

- 1.0 All of the strategic allocations have been subject to work to prove that they are capable of delivering the amount and mix of development proposed in the Development Templates included as Appendix A to the main Core Strategy document.
- 1.1 Detailed negotiations have been conducted with the owners and their agents regarding their commitment to development. This has been based on a Master Planning process which demonstrates commitment utilising the quanta and mix of uses as set out in the Development Templates. Reasonable build rates have also been identified from the forward projections of developers and looking at past build rates (see housing Trajectory at Appendix H, page 228 of the Core Strategy). The landowners/agents/developers have also submitted their own representations to the process which highlight their commitment. These are Savills for Hampton Park, Terrance O'Rourke for Archers Gate, Pro Vision for Netherhampton Road, Smiths Gore for Longhedge and Pegasus Planning for Fugglestone Red. Because of the slightly different delivery mechanisms, Defence Estates are representing the interests of the owner of the UKLF at Wilton (the MOD propose to market the site with planning permission), and the Salisbury Vision (joint local delivery vehicle) is taking the commercial lead on Churchfields and the Maltings/Central Car Park.
- 1.2 The Council set up a working group called the Consultative Technical Group (CTG), comprising statutory consultees and essential infrastructure providers. The minutes of these meetings are included in Topic Paper 17, 'Infrastructure', Appendix 1. This work has confirmed that there are no insurmountable environmental constraints or essential infrastructure barriers to the delivery of the amount and mix of development planned. This information is collated in Topic Paper 17, 'Infrastructure' and the requirements for each site are set out in the Development Templates at Appendix A of the Core Strategy. Site assessment and application of the principles of 'Creating Places' the adopted South Wiltshire Design Guide allowed essential place shaping criteria to be identified. An ongoing tripartite working arrangement between developer, community and Council on sites such as Fugglestone Red, Hampton Park and the UKLF has allowed social infrastructure to be discussed and agreed. This approach will be rolled out on all strategic sites.
- 1.3 Scoping the essential infrastructure, place shaping criteria and listening to community aspirations has allowed a detailed picture of the cost of development to be attained and this has been subject to independent viability work carried out on behalf of the The Strategic Sites Viability Overview Assessment by Adams Integra (EIP library ref: STU/48), which has confirmed that the sites are economically viable. The Council has taken the approach that only essential requirements have been identified so as to not unnecessarily fetter the development process.
- 1.4 Densities have been tailored to the characteristics of the site with higher densities being promoted in more urban sites such as at Churchfields, but all have taken account of the local contextual cues and will allow locally sympathetic design which respects its wider setting.

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?*

- 2.0 Frontloading of the Strategy is deliberately planned in order to address fundamental issues relating to delivery and especially the need to address local housing need which has been exacerbated by the historic slow delivery rates in South Wiltshire. The frontloading of the strategy is about identifying unconstrained sites that can be brought forward relatively easily and have not been phased to limit the rate at which they can deliver. The approach taken in the Core Strategy i.e. use of development templates, supports this approach in that there is no requirement for any further policy work prior to a planning application being submitted.
- 2.1 Historically low build rates have contributed to a high level of demand for new housing across all sectors. The business community in particular has highlighted the lack of affordable housing as a major barrier to attracting a viable workforce to the area. The evidence identified to support paragraph 3.3 of the Core Strategy (See footnotes on pages 19 and 20 of the Core Strategy document), indicates that without delivering a step change in housing delivery, the character of Salisbury will slide into the role of a dormitory settlement with an ageing population, lack of employment base, declining retail sector and consequential environmentally harmful out commuting. It is clear to give the Salisbury a boost then a frontloaded strategy is necessary. To allow the decline of Salisbury into a dormitory function would be contrary to national policy in PPS4 (paragraph 9) and does not conform the SSCT status afforded Salisbury in the draft South West RSS. It also clearly not what the community want as expressed through the consultation process into both the Salisbury Vision and Core Strategy preparation.
- 2.2 A frontloaded strategy is also essential to deliver the Salisbury Vision which has the economic regeneration of Salisbury at its heart. In particular there are interdependencies between the strategic sites, at Fugglestone Red, Netherhampton Road, Longhedge, UKLF and Imerys which are planned to deliver enough employment land to meet projected future needs as set out in the draft South West RSS, and also allow existing businesses the opportunity to decant from Churchfields.

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?*

- 3.1 The number of houses that are expected to be delivered from the strategic allocations per annum are as follows:

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Fugglestone Red	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	150	100	100	100	100		
Hampton Park	30	80	80	100	110	100								
Longhedge	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100						
Churchfields & Engine Shed				100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
UKLF		50	100	100	100	100								
Nether-hampton Rd	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50						
Central Car Park			50	50	50	50								
Kings Gate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

3.2 The Council wrote to agents acting for the strategic allocations on 8 January 2009 (Appendix A to this Statement) requesting information on delivery rates. In response to this letter, the planning consultants for the Hampton Park allocation provided the development rates, as shown in the above table. This is set out in a letter dated 27 January (Appendix B to this Statement).

3.3 In response to the Council's letter dated 8 January, the agents of the Kings Gate site in Amesbury also verbally confirmed that on the assumption of two developers on site, 50 dwellings (per developer) per year is likely to be the rate of delivery. This rate of delivery is further confirmed by the fact that housing delivery on the current site at Archer's Gate by Persimmon and Bloor's has been built at the following rates:

Persimmon

48 completions in 2007
102 in 2008
75 in 2009

Bloor

56 in 2007
52 in 2008
56 in 2009

Mixed sites of Persimmon & Bloor

7 in 2008

3.4 These rates of delivery have been confirmed by the Monitoring and Evidence Team at Wiltshire Council. Furthermore, the agents for the Kings Gate site have since provided further evidence which demonstrates that in fact delivery is more likely to be 90 dwellings per year per developer (Appendix C to this Statement).

3.5 As these past completion rates on an earlier phase at Archer's Gate in Amesbury confirm that the estimated completion rates at Kings Gate are realistic, it was considered reasonable to apply this development rate (that is, assuming two developers on site who each deliver 50 dwellings per year) to the other strategic allocations. For some of the strategic sites, the agents do not act for the developers who will actually develop the site and therefore could not give any meaningful indication of what delivery rates were likely to be, hence the application of the Kings Gate development rate.

3.6 Since the housing trajectory was prepared, developers for the Fugglestone Red site have confirmed in a letter dated 8 July 09 (see Appendix D to this Statement) that housing delivery can take place within 5 years at the following rate:

2011/12 - 150
2012/13 – 300
2013/14 – 400
2014/15 – 250
2015/16 – 150

3.7 In terms of the likely viability of the residential elements of the strategic allocations, the study by Adams Integra entitled “Strategic Sites – Viability Overview Assessment” concludes at paragraph 5.1.1 (STU/48) that all strategic sites are or have the potential to be viable, bearing in mind a 40% affordable housing assumption and assuming a suitably active property market and development climate.

3.8 Similarly, as part of the SHLAA (STU/06), evidence was obtained from the Salisbury office of Chesterton Humberts to assess viability issues (see section 3.46 of SHLAA). This assessment concluded that, at the time data was obtained (March 2009), it is evident that the housing market in Salisbury is economically viable, with the average house prices in all locations, for all the types of dwellings being more than the cost to build such a property.

3.9 With regards to the employment elements of these strategic sites and the former Imerys quarry which is the only strategic site purely allocated for employment use, employment land delivery is market driven and evidence of delivery rates of employment land cannot be presented in the same way as housing delivery rates.

3.10 However, detailed discussions with the developers and/or agents have resulted in the creation of masterplans for several of the sites, and commissioning of various studies/surveys, demonstrating the commitment to delivery (table 11, TOP/02C). The Council has also been involved in detailed discussions with infrastructure providers who have indicated that there are no insurmountable barriers to delivery, as detailed in Topic Paper 17 (TOP/17A). No major infrastructure is required to allow delivery of these sites, and only site specific infrastructure is required to enable implementation, as listed in the development templates at Appendix A of the Core Strategy (SWCS/01A).

3.11 With regards to the Salisbury Vision sites, the formalisation and commitment to the Vision delivery vehicle is clear evidence of reasonable prospects of delivery. Key to the project is that the Vision Board for Salisbury is multi-organisational and has a strong partnership approach involving public and private sectors. A wide range of key organisations are involved under a strong chairperson. Critically:

- the Vision Board is backed by Wiltshire Council cabinet, Council leader, members and with good officer support
- the Vision Board Strategy is backed up by dedicated dynamic Vision Director who has key expertise and a strong delivery focus.

- The Vision Board Strategy acts as a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to deliver affordable housing and business needs for S. Wilts.

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?*

- 4.0 A major contributory factor towards the acute housing demand and the need to deliberately plan for the frontloading of the strategy, is the historically slow build rates in south Wiltshire, caused by allocated sites not being developed in a timely manner. Taking advice from PPS3 paragraph 54 and PPS12, paragraph 4.45 regarding 'deliverability', detailed dialogue with developers and landowners to secure their commitment to delivering the strategic sites has been vigorously pursued by the Council. Only sites where there is a clear commitment on behalf of the developer have sites been included in the Core Strategy, otherwise they would not be considered 'deliverable' as defined in paragraph 54 of PPS3. Furthermore the sites have only been chosen where no major national policy (eg wildlife constraints) or essential infrastructure barriers exist.
- 4.1 The commitment that has been displayed by developers informing this strategy has been extremely positive, with many well advanced Master Plans being developed. There is every reason to expect delivery. However need is so acute that there is no time to lose. The milestones set out within the Core Strategy are not considered to be too onerous as an allowance has been built in to the programme for a further year and half to submit the necessary Master Plans associated with the planning application / permission process. An additional year for commencement of development has also been allocated. If development has not commenced within 2.5 years of adoption of the Core Strategy, then the deliverability of the site must be questioned in relation to the potential to make a meaningful contribution to local needs and PPS3 requirements for a five year supply of housing and the initial commitment of the developer. The milestones will be monitored through the AMR and will trigger a review but there is enough contingency built into the Strategy to allow this to happen without affecting the five year supply of new homes.
- 4.2 The central car park is an omission and milestones should be included (with suitable monitoring mechanisms) as with other sites within the Development Template at Appendix A of the Core Strategy.
- 4.3 Although Churchfields is a complex site, evidence from discussions with major landowners and their commitment towards re-development, the programme of the Salisbury Vision Local Development Vehicle and the significant strategic commitment to the project by the Council with its significant landholdings; indicate that a contribution from this site within 2.5 years is reasonable. The Churchfields development will be carefully phased and will be planned to align with the delivery of potential decant sites.

However there is both commercial and community appetite to ensure that the project commences within the earlier phases of the Core Strategy project.

Question 5.5. Transport. An Insurmountable Barrier? *The CS states that there are in, highways and transportation terms, no insurmountable barriers to delivery; that the transport network, with improvements, will be able to support the levels of growth over the plan period; and that it is unlikely that new road building will be required. What is the evidence to support these statements?*

5.0 In preparing Wiltshire Council's third Local Transport Plan (LTP – due for publication March 2011) the Cabinet Member for transport has approved a report setting out the strategic direction of the plan (CPP04).

5.1 The Council has followed the approach set out in the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (RPP02), especially policies

RTS1 – Corridor Management and

RTS2 Demand Management and Sustainable Travel Measures at the SCTS

5.2 A transport model (STU50a) was undertaken in order to assess the transport impacts of planned growth in and around Salisbury. The transport model was developed which shows how and when people travel by car, bus and train in Salisbury. When the model is run, the results show how much traffic there is on the roads, and how many people use public transport. The model also tells us how congested the roads are now and in the future. The model has then been used to test the transport impact of building more houses and providing more jobs for the year 2026.

5.3 The model has been used to prepare an options assessment report (STU50b) as a key component of strategy development. This considers the performance of two options: An Established Approach and a Radical Option. Both options are fundamentally led by the demand management principles set out in the RTS. Whilst these two approaches are not opposites, they provide a means of comparing a continuation of established policies in a financially constrained environment against a range of radical/extended measures that rely more heavily upon developer funding.

5.4 The specifics of those approaches are set out in the document, however there is clear evidence to show that while the increases in travel demand and impacts on transport network performance are projected to be significant, the growth in travel demand can be accommodated. This can be achieved by adopting an appropriately progressive transport strategy comprising a set of interventions that make best use of available infrastructure, provide alternatives to car use and seek to manage travel demand and are affordable and deliverable within the powers available to the Council. This could include improvements to park and ride, bus priority measures, increasing frequency and routes of buses, and encouraging smarter choices such as car sharing work and school travel plans and car clubs. Whilst the approach contains some specific junction improvements, they are contained within the public highway, will not require separate planning permission, and do not rely on bids for major scheme funding for road building projects from DfT.

Question 5.6. Transport. What, Who and When? *What are the highway and transportation measures, or range of potential measures, that would need to be put in place in order to ensure that the transport network would be able to support the Strategic Sites? In developing these sites can congestion and safety problems on the major transport corridors of the A303 and A36 be overcome, can pressure on the Salisbury ring road be accommodated and can meaningful alternative transport choices to the private car be provided? Who would be responsible for financing and implementing any measures that would be required and when would they be implemented?*

6.0 The range of potential transport measures that have the potential to support growth are set out in the Options Assessment Report, and can be summarised into 5 main measures.

Measure	Example
Demand management (Para 5.5)	Encourage and promote park and ride service, parking charges to manage demand, and parking controls.
Traffic management (Para 5.20)	Road hierarchy, from principal roads to those with shared surfaces, network improvements such as junction improvements
Intelligent Transport Systems (Para 5.40)	Including bus priority and queue management, Real Time Passenger Information, and signage and car park management system
Public transport	Increasing bus frequency for commuters, fare levels to encourage use, improved bus routes
Smarter Choices (Para 5.59)	Travel plans, car sharing, car clubs

6.1 The Highways Agency are responsible for the A303 and A36. The Agency has been a member of the Salisbury transport strategy steering group, and their interests have been taken into account in developing options for change. In particular, regard has been made to RTS which advocates strategies that include

“...demand management measures and improvements ...that will **reduce the rate** (writer’s emphasis) of road traffic congestion on the corridors of national and regional importance”

6.2 The policy is written in such a way that recognises that it is not realistic to entertain high relative levels of growth and achieve a “nil detriment” outcome. (as evidenced by the predictions in DfT’s National Trip End Model TEMPRO (STU50c)

6.3 The options assessment report demonstrates that the core strategy can be implemented and with the demand management measures put forward the impact on the highway network including the A36 will be acceptable.

6.4 Finance and Delivery

The Council commissioned Atkins to produce a schedule of costs associated with the Established Approach and the Radical/Extended Option. They are set out in Table 7.2 of the technical report on funding (STU50b) and indicate the likely cost over the whole plan period.

- 6.5 The Established Approach would cost approximately £15 million between now and 2026 without hypothecated parking charges and approximately £13 million with hypothecated parking charges. The main expenditure would be park and ride and bus provision.
- 6.6 The Radical Approach, includes the expansion of Beehive Park and Ride site, highway improvements, improvements to bus and park and ride and additional ITS (Intelligent Transport Systems) and smarter choices. This strategy contains over £7 million of capital costs and would cost between approximately £45 million and £30 million depending upon the level of hypothecated revenue from parking charges.
- 6.7 One of the main principles underpinning the Core Strategy is that of front loading, and that all the sites can be delivered from the strategy, without any further policy documents being required. The highways infrastructure that is required to enable all the strategic sites to be delivered will be provided in two ways. Firstly the direct infrastructure will either be provided by the developers or a contribution will be made, and secondly all sites will contribute to the off site measures required to mitigate the cumulative effects that this level of development will bring. In the time prior to an adopted LDD on an infrastructure levy, the costs will be apportioned to each development on a per dwelling basis, as set out in the technical note on funding (CD STU50b). The mechanism for securing this funding will be through negotiations on a site by site basis via a Section 106 agreement.
- 6.8 In order to ensure that such a contribution is viable, Atkins have undertaken a high level assessment of affordability. Their conclusion is that the Salisbury Transport Strategy would cost approximately £1000 to £1100 per dwelling (for each of the 12,400 dwellings) for the Established Approach and between £2400 and £3600 per dwelling depending upon the level of revenue hypothecation from parking charges for the Radical approach.
- 6.9 The Atkins report compares the above charges with a number of other examples, and concludes that the cost of the Salisbury Transport Strategy per dwelling compares well with neighbouring authorities, and whilst fine tuning of the options is still required, the strategy is affordable. Even if the higher contribution was sought, this could still allow for the sites to be economically viable as the Adams Integra viability report made an allowance of £4,000 per dwelling for transport contributions (core document STU48 para 4.22.3), 40% affordable housing, other infrastructure and place shaping contributions and still proved the viability of the sites.
- 6.10 Atkins have also looked at the phasing of measures that will be required, and in summary they conclude that 'there is not a straight line relationship between development phasing and the measures needed' (STU50b Technical note on Phasing) In essence, the contributions raised for improvements will be received before the significant capital works will need to be carried out.

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?*

- 7.0 Topic Paper 17 (Infrastructure) details the level of commitment and investment required from service providers to support the proposed development at Salisbury SSCT – as summarised in paragraph 5.31. In addition, Topic Paper 18 (Water Management) details specific requirements of the local water environment, supported by the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). Much of this information comes directly from providers themselves and has been summarised into Core Policy 2 and paragraph 5.31 to provide clarity.
- 7.1 The infrastructure covered in Topic Paper 17 relates to water supply and sewerage, primary care facilities, emergency services, education, transport, open space, archaeological protection, green infrastructure and flood alleviation infrastructure. As well as covering strategic requirements (summarised in paragraph 5.31), this Topic Paper also includes site specific, detailed requirements that have been transposed into the development templates at Appendix A of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (CS).
- 7.2 This information has been scoped out by working in partnership with infrastructure providers throughout the plan preparation period. The processes undertaken to ensure Infrastructure delivery are explained in Topic Paper 17 (section 2) and include the establishment of a Consultative Technical Group' as well as individual meetings with key infrastructure providers. Through this partnership working, providers have confirmed that Strategic Allocations and Saved Local Plan Allocations could start in the short term without awaiting any of the key strategic elements of infrastructure. Assurances have also been received that all works will be delivered at an appropriate time within the CS plan period.
- 7.3 For information with respect to delivery of transport infrastructure the council's statement with respect to Matter 5.5 and 5.6 should be referred to together with the Salisbury Transport Strategy (STU/50).
- 7.4 While there is no key strategic infrastructure that should be in place before any particular development takes place, it will still be important for site specific infrastructure to be delivered by the developer predominantly upfront or on a phased basis. Negotiations to secure appropriate and necessary improvements should take place during the planning application / section 106 process. Specific detail in respect to the key strategic elements of infrastructure is provided in our response to question 5.8 below.

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?

- 8.0 As discussed in the council's response to question 5.7 much the information is provided within Topic paper's 17 Infrastructure and 18 Water. However since the Topic Paper was written further information from Infrastructure providers may have been provided. Infrastructure provision is summarised in the table at Appendix 1,

Appendix 1- Infrastructure Provision

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
That additional pressures on the sewerage network, particularly around Salisbury be accommodated	TP 17, section 4.	New Relief Sewer within upstream catchment at Old Sarum, Hampton Park and Longhedge to ensure risk from sewer flooding is resolved.	Wessex Water will ensure delivery through capital projects which can be funded through statutory requisition procedures or developer contribution. Off site works can be delivered by Wessex Water or the developer.	Developer to Old Sarum, Longhedge and Hampton Park sites through developer contributions or off site improvements work carried out by developer.	Phased improvements linked to the rate of development will be programmed by Wessex Water. Detailed engineering appraisals need to be undertaken to confirm the scope and extent of capacity improvements to the public sewer system. Where spare capacity is available threshold levels for phased improvements can be agreed. A drainage strategy for each site can be agreed/approved or conditioned before planning consents are granted.	Detailed engineering appraisal will be completed with network modelling and flow survey to develop a robust sewerage strategy to satisfy capacity planning for South Wiltshire. Contributions will be required from the developer to complete this work.
		Petersfinger Sewerage Treatment works – No planned improvements during the next 5 year	Wessex Water.	Wessex Water	N/A	N/A

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
		<p>period. The works has satisfactory hydraulic capacity to treat predicted flows. Future works depend upon process capacity, any future consent review and replacing mechanical and electrical apparatus.</p> <p>Amesbury STW – Planned improvements between 2010-2015 will provide capacity for future development within STW catchment.</p>	Wessex Water.	Wessex Water.	By 2015.	
That phosphate and pollution levels in local watercourses can be controlled (see also CP 20);	See Topic Paper 18 – Water and council’s response to matter 12, question 12.3 and Natural England proof on 12.3 / 5.8					
That an adequate	Topic Paper 17 –	The Integrated Water Supply Grid will	Wessex Water	Wessex Water will provide funding for	This is a regional scheme which will be	N/A

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
water supply can be provided to new developments; (See also CP 19);	Infrastructure section 4. Please also see council's response to matter 12.2.	provide access to alternative water resources within the Wessex Water region, and safeguard security of supply and deal with impact of abstraction on low river flows.		this project. Works for the grid have been approved by OFWAT through the final determination of prices in November 2009.	delivered over a ten year period. There are a series of over 20 projects that will be implemented through the period to 2018.	
That the additional demand for emergency services be dealt with;	Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure section 6.	Fire and Rescue: Upgrade to fire service provision to ensure continued response times. May comprise extension and rationalisation of existing buildings.	The Fire and Rescue Service.	Fire and Rescue Service with some developer contributions.	Developer contributions upfront so FRS can make upfront capital investment for when occupation occurs Need to commence 2010/11.	Further negotiations between FRW /Council / developer need to occur. Proposals put forward need to be refined and negotiated.
That the additional demand for healthcare be dealt with;	Topic Paper 17 Infrastructure section 5	Development of a primary care centre ('super surgery') incorporating New Street and Grove House surgeries on Fountain Way site. This will provide for future need created by further development. Re-provision of Castle Street Surgery to meet	Within Wiltshire PCT's Strategic Framework 2009-2014 and Reforming Community Services Programme (RCSP). Wiltshire PCT.	PCT and developer contributions. PCT with support from developer	RCSP programmes development by end 2011. Target delivery likely to be end 2011 / early 2012. 2011	

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
		<p>shortcomings of existing facility and provide additional patient numbers at Avon Approach site.</p> <p>Further dentist chairs required, possible space available on Fountain Way site.</p>	Wiltshire PCT.	<p>contributions.</p> <p>PCT with support from developer contributions.</p>	N/A	
That the additional demand for school places be dealt with?	Topic Paper 17: Infrastructure section 7.	Secondary Education New Academy through re-build of Salisbury High School – result in increase of school places from 1000 to 1450 plus post 16 pupils.	Wiltshire Council Property and Education.	Wiltshire Council with funding from the DFES Academy programme. Council is currently at the feasibility stage. To get to this stage the council already needed to pass through the Expression of Interest stage with the DFES. If Academy does not come off for some reason will use developer contributions and council funds to expand / refurbish.	Intended that Salisbury High will open as Academy within existing buildings in September 2010 with new buildings opening September 2013.	Continuing work by Wiltshire Council education to drawing up feasibility and plans.

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
		Plans to increase Trafalgar School, Downton from 450 to 900 pupils and Stonehenge School, Amesbury from 800 to 1200	Wiltshire Council Property and Education.	With support from developer contributions. For Salisbury current spare places (excluding Stonehenge) will be apportioned across all development so that all housing sites pay an equitable share.	Unknown. Decision still needs to be taken politically as to whether the council will take forward these expansions or require a new secondary school or both. If a new secondary school is required, a site will need to be found within the Site Specific Allocations DPD. Contributions should be paid at commencement of development to allow the LEA time to implement extensions etc.	
		Primary education	For all sites - Wiltshire Council Education and Property and Developers.	For all sites - Developers with any shortfall from government funding.	Generally - phased in line with build out of site.	
		Fugglestone Red: Site for 2 form entry (FE)			Phased in line with build out of site	

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
		<p>primary plus contributions to build or construction undertaken by developers.</p> <p>Hampton Park: 1 FE Primary</p> <p>Churchfields: 2 FE Primary</p> <p>Land south of Netherhampton Road: Site for 1 FE primary plus financial contributions.</p> <p>Longhedge: 2 FE Primary site with a 1 FE school delivered.</p> <p>Kings Gate: New wing of existing primary school at Archers Gate, plus a 1 FE primary.</p> <p>Other sites to provide primary financial</p>			<p>Complete once 50% of site is built.</p> <p>Phased in line with build out of site</p> <p>Site will be built if additional future development in the south of Salisbury requires facility.</p> <p>Phased in line with build out of site</p> <p>Phased in line with build out of site</p> <p>At commencement of development.</p>	

	Topic Paper section or where more information provided	What infrastructure to be provided	Who will be responsible for implementing	Who would be responsible for financing the infrastructure	When will the infrastructure be implemented.	Further work?
		contributions. Maltings /CCP UKLF				
That important green infrastructure is provided or retained?	Topic Paper 17 Section 10. See council's response to matter 12.4.					