

MATTER 6. DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT – OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPLY.

Question 6.1 Delivery of the Saved Local Plan Allocations. *The Saved Local Plan Allocations have not been developed in the period since 2003 when the Salisbury District Local Plan was adopted. What evidence is there to indicate that they are likely to be developed over the life of the CS?*

1. No comment other than in re-allocating previously allocated sites, the Council should be demonstrating why they are still deliverable, 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)).
4. 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 6.2. Delivery of Future Strategic Areas of Search. *The CS makes clear (paragraph 6.29) that additional work, including discussions with landowners and infrastructure providers, is necessary to prove the deliverability of the strategic areas of search. What progress has been made on this and is there evidence to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect of these areas delivering 1000 or so homes and 15 ha of employment land in the lifetime of the CS?*

1. No comment.

Question 6.3. Delivery of Salisbury Vision Sites. *What evidence is there to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect of the Salisbury Vision sites delivering 800 or so dwellings over the lifetime of the CS?*

Overview

1. Some of the Salisbury Vision sites which provide scope for housing are more aspirational and less deliverable 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.