

## **South Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document**

### **Representation to proposed changes for submission June 2010**

#### **Submitted by Wiltshire Councillor Ian M<sup>c</sup>Lennan Member for Laverstock, Ford & Old Sarum all within the parish of Laverstock & Ford**

I thank you for the opportunity to submit further comment based on proposed amendments to the submitted strategy. However, at this earliest opportunity, I wish to state that, with the demise of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the ability for local decision making becoming available, I will also make comments about the impact on my parish and the treatment of it within the current documents.

I do this, in order to seek to review the demands made on the parish and also to highlight this information to the Inspector, as some of the information may not be apparent by reading the documentation.

Before my detailed observations, I believe there is a need to state the following:

1. **Laverstock & Ford Parish** includes, **Hampton Park** (500 existing properties and community facilities) and **Old Sarum** (180 approximately previously existing dwellings with 674 new dwellings and community facilities to be provided via the last Local Plan – only 177 of which have been built and occupied despite supposed incredible demand for housing in the Salisbury environs).
2. Despite being totally distinct from Salisbury and insistent on remaining independent from Salisbury (unanimous vote in the parish), the parish is rarely mentioned and no reference is made to the make up of the parish and its integrated links. Instead, it is referred, at best as land east or north east of Salisbury, when seeking to plant a minimum *additional* 1300 dwellings within it. Primarily, the parish is a rural parish and yet is being earmarked 'in disguise' for a large dollop of housing under a Salisbury banner. The parish lies within the Southern Area Board geography and yet, once again, is virtually erased from view as a parish, within the planning documents, despite dating back to the earliest of times. It is quite possible, that the village will be asked to concrete over more fields as a contribution to the Southern Area demands as well.
3. The Forward Planners are aware of this and yet have been unable/unwilling to rectify, in case of jeopardising their already impossible task of site finding. I write this now, in the hope of common sense from the Planning Inspector and/or a rethink by Wiltshire Council.
4. If the Strategy remains unaltered, the rural parish of Laverstock and Ford will increase from approximately 2000 dwellings to more than double – over

4000 in the next 20 years. This will greatly change the rural status – the only parish subjected to this possibility, when all other parishes are fondly coveted with emphasis on retaining character. This is an opportunity to redress this ‘bullying by building’.

5. It is important for the Parish to retain its independence, as already stated. However, it is also of vital importance to retain Laverstock as the primary settlement within the parish. With this in mind, should **Longhedge** be developed, it should be distinct from **Old Sarum**, which will already have approximately 860 dwellings agreed. Instead of Longhedge “integrated with Old Sarum” references should show the distinct settlements in words and actual geography – a clear divide by open space, as promised to me in early discussions. I am sure the Parish Council will, however, wish to continue its tradition of encouraging links for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders, which currently link the parish from top to bottom.
  
6. To put this ‘distinct and independent’ point in perspective, the four communities of the parish helped produce the Parish Plan. The ‘proud to be near Salisbury but distinct from it’ statement was a continuous mantra, as was the need to protect the rural outlook and character, particularly by retaining and increasing access to the green spaces – farm and down land primarily. The parish is larger than Wilton on the west side of Salisbury and yet is in no way afforded either the same reverence or protection from its creeping neighbour.
  
7. With all that said, I have personally encouraged dialogue and co-operation between officers (with an impossible task) and the Parish Council (who are a realistic, practical group, who realise the geography involved).

The reality is that, if local people are able to have a true and fair voice and be heard, then the following should be taken into consideration and actioned upon:

Reference to **Laverstock’s** 125 newly built houses at Duck Lane (now Pilgrims way), in the last Local Plan was reduced to 50 yet to be built within this process. I note that all reference to this has been deleted now. It is, nonetheless, important to remember to keep score!

Ford was highlighted in the original documentation as a place to leave intact. That got watered down along the way and then out of the blue, without consultation, the **Ford** and **Old Sarum Airfield** fields suddenly gained some large possible development areas. I managed to persuade fellow members, at the ratifying Full Council (Wiltshire Council), that these last minute inclusions were both suspicious, and unfair/unlawful consultation. The Ford element was removed as a result. This should not be allowed to creep back in.

Further, at **Old Sarum Airfield** ‘Northern’ sites, the need was not justified nor tested by consultation. The projects certainly fall into the ‘suddenly came from nowhere’ group. The Airfield had, until Wiltshire Council, a ‘forum’ to handle complaints. Complaints were negligible and were from a minute number of regular individuals. Alterations to take off and landing techniques and angles

virtually extinguished them. I see no need for any further development being allowed in order to 'restrict' flying by planning rules. It is now in the interest of the developer to extinguish flying, so that is more the danger, now that the 'independent' technical opinion of the flying club is no longer available.

Finally, in this area, there are obscure references to heritage and improving the visual amenity towards Old Sarum monument. This is so vague as to be valueless and therefore does not warrant, at this stage, inclusion in the preferred development sites of a Core Strategy. None of these area aforementioned have been publicly consulted upon and should not be ratified.

### **Hampton Park Extension – proposed 500 dwellings**

The area proposed for development is the 'Strategic Gap' separating Hampton Park and Ford. This has been promoted by officers as 'close to the city' and suitable. 'Up to 500' has now become 500.

The backdrop to this area was that the landowner/developer sold Hampton Park on the basis of a club house and golf course being provided for the new residents. The higher priced dwellings being along the current boundary with views over the 'golf course'. Later, a suggestion for a Millennium' project, by this owner/developer was for 200 dwellings and a 'Millennium Park'. This was rejected by Salisbury District Council out of hand and at the last Local Plan reinforced as an essential strategic gap.

At the end of Hampton Park is a triangle of land labelled as 'non food retail'. This is not desired but gains permissions by stealth or appeal overturns on technicalities. This would be better as housing, as requested by the locals, with the strategic gap retained.

The difficulty of exiting onto the A30 London Road should be considered as a reason for reducing or removing the development numbers. Access for lorries via the rail bridge is also a problem never sorted, only talked about. This should be part of any further development requirements.

**I suggest that this site is a direct invasion of the strategic gap separating Hampton Park and Ford and should be removed from the document.**

**Should this not be accepted**, then the fall back position would include the doubling of the newly proposed 'strategic slither' at least, taking into account that there are properties at Ford (Roman Road) which are on the same side of the road and would not benefit at all from the proposed space.

Also, when determining the size of land able to be developed, land south of Green Lane is on high ground and overlooking other Ford Lane residents. This land could instead, be deemed to be the Southern entrance to the proposed Country Park, with access therefore able to be gained by all existing parish residents and visitors, without passing through a housing development. This is particularly important, when considering the parish desire for further bridle paths to encourage riders.

At the Northern end of the site, Apostle Way is also compromised. The site should be further contracted to retain a sense of place for the existing Hampton Park residents.

Whilst the Country Park would be a welcome addition to the Parish's public open space, it is not sufficient to 'gift' this 'difficult for developer' land, without maintenance monies suitably apportioned. It should also be noted that the Parish of Laverstock & Ford would not wish to remove the boundary hedge/ditch/tree line which divides it from the city, as prescribed in the 'Beat the Inspector' planning application in the pipeline. Nor should the County Park be designed as an urban park. The preference would be to encourage habitat restoration and traditional community supported farming practices in addition to informal recreation and public access. This is an opportunity to bring the public closer to the chalk downs and water meadows

As this development is labelled as an extension to Hampton Park (in L&F Parish and not the city) **I suggest the number of dwellings which may 'dovetail with the existing development may be 200. A denser development should not exceed 300 with a wide strategic gap including public access to the River Bourne, land south of Green Lane and all the land listed as 'Country Park' which extends to the Parish boundary with Salisbury City in the North (the bridleway leading from Old Castle Road southwards, as depicted on the Laverstock & Ford Parish map. (See Wiltshire Council website).**

## **Old Sarum**

The Core strategy reminds us that 630 dwellings are contained within the Local Plan with the majority being carried forward – despite this urgency for housing, only 177 have been purchased and occupied throughout the length of the Local Plan timetable. I would point out at this point that an additional 44 dwellings have been accepted already, in order to secure some green space (equivalent to a junior football pitch) in the centre of the new development and at the rear of the existing Partridge Way social housing. This makes a total of **674** without any new proposals at Longhedge.

**However, the situation has changed recently.** The Salisbury City Football Club, who occupy the Raymond McEnhill stadium in Partridge Way, have stated that the reduction of the MOD playing fields to a 'junior pitch' size would seriously jeopardise their plans. They wish to develop their club premises as a community hub, with residents being encouraged to use the premises as their social and sports recreation area. The pitches would be redesigned to include a five a side all weather surface within it and this would also be available to the local population.

The club have discussed this with Persimmon, who apparently, are willing to discuss further. Their initial thought, according to the football club, being to replace some of the employment land to the west of the development site with the 44 agreed dwellings, possibly more. Council officers have been asked to pursue, following a meeting with the Cabinet Member Stuart Wheeler, officers and other members, together with the football club. The council is interested in retaining the sports pitches and developing the community hub idea.

Any additional housing over the 44 dwellings will have repercussions with the school size and our inability to increase the building...owing to developer stingy allocation of space.

**I suggest that this latest development is pursued and encouraged, in the interest of the existing and new local Old Sarum Community and the future prosperity of the football club – Wiltshire Council's only professional club.**

## **Longhedge**

800 additional dwellings and 8 hectares of Employment Land earmarked. I have covered the need to distinguish this proposed settlement from Old Sarum, should it go ahead, owing to the dramatic change in dynamics of the Laverstock & Ford Parish. However, any displaced employment land, supposedly still required, if any is lost at Old Sarum, could be absorbed here. At this point, I would point out that the entire North of the Parish of Laverstock & Ford would then be concreted over. This would dramatically change the nature of the rural parish and remove farmland.

The question then raised, in the light of local need, is that there is none, based on the take up of Old Sarum over several years. It is fine to look at the need for affordable housing but useless to try and deliver it on the back of unwanted private housing.

During the last Local Plan, the Inspector decided that the council should choose one of the two proposed large housing developments on green sites. This choice was between Old Sarum (where facilities for the existing residents was the promise (since reneged on) and Fugglestone Red, which was to house Salisbury's cemetery. Old Sarum was chosen.

Not much farther down the A345 is Archers Gate, which is also earmarked (and welcomed) for many more houses. I would appear that so many houses in close proximity would adversely affect Old sarum and Archers Gate, which are already under way.

**I suggest that on this occasion, the Fugglestone Red site is chosen, together with the extension to Archers gate and Longhedge removed.**

**Should Longhedge be retained, then the number should revert to the original 300 accepted number, with some employment land.** This would afford some chance for Old Sarum to be successfully developed and the houses sold.

**In all cases where development is earmarked for Laverstock & Ford Parish and is retained by the Inspector, despite my submissions, I ask that residents of Laverstock & Ford Parish, or their direct family, should be given priority over any other applicant, for the social and affordable housing. It would be incongruous to think that a rural parish can be concreted over and that their residents have no priority or rights in the housing allocations.**

## **In conclusion**

I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to present further thoughts and concerns to the Inspector and thank him for that. I hope I have conveyed the

distress felt in Laverstock & Ford Parish about the 'convenient removal' of the parish, to suit planning needs and yet the Winterbournes, for example and Wilton, have been omitted from the onslaught and yet have the same characteristics and L&F parish and some suitable development sites.

On a wider note, I believe the whole strategy of overdeveloping Salisbury and surround and leaving the parishes untouched is very wrong. Of course Salisbury must properly develop, however, sustainability is a bigger issue in villages, where generations of villagers are being 'moved' to the city for a chance of a home and their village 'fossilised' and the properties purchased by rich incomers, who want the fossil to remain and the locals gone. Sadly, these incomers have the ability to takeover the local democratic structures and make this the 'local' view, which of course, it is not. I say the strategy needs a complete review.

**Laverstock & Ford rural parish is not Salisbury East.**

.....

***What follows is the comment on the proposed alterations to the wording of the Core Strategy. You now know my thoughts on all these sites, so my comments relate to the words, assuming that some or all sections may still be retained and need correct words.***

**MAJ/02 Core Policy 1**

Reject the policy which delivers false numbers of houses and employment land in these times of promised long economic uncertainty. For Salisbury the number 7480 is unsustainable and unfounded in itself.

The Southern Community Area – most of the villages mentioned have nothing whatsoever to do with Downton as a service centre nor even a road system to deliver them to Downton, without recourse to Salisbury or via extreme rural roads.

Laverstock & Ford Parish sits within this group happily and does not wish to be considered part of Salisbury

**Maj/03 Transportation**

Whilst the words read well, it is fanciful to say the least and if believed, may seriously jeopardise the wellbeing of the city and nearby parishes.

**Maj/05 Core Policy 12 Porton Down**

Fine except that the housing needs for this site would best be served by revisiting the A30 site which originally proposed 2500 dwellings as a new settlement in the bungled original plan. This is an ideal site for such a plan and would fulfil many needs and also relieve Salisbury, without interfering with any other settlement. However, 2500 seems excessive!

**Maj/12 Hampton Park**

Should read:

**The area of land to the east of Salisbury and within the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford is limited by the A345**, the rest of the sentence remains as proposed.

## Objectives for the development

To develop 200 homes through a high quality...etc Later in the sentence... replace Bishopdown Farm with **Hampton Park**.

Reason: Bishopdown Farm is in the city (at present) and Hampton Park is in L&F parish and therefore 'complements' should reflect Hampton Park and not the city.

Later...

- Protect the strategic landscape setting of the northern slopes of **Laverstock and Ford Parish**

Reason: These slopes are not in Salisbury

- The delivery of a significant country park that will be handed to the local community **of Laverstock & Ford Parish** in perpetuity.
- To plan for the permanent retention and enhancement of the Castle Hill/Bishopdown rural corridor, within Laverstock & Ford Parish, to link Salisbury with the surrounding chalk downs and watermeadows to enable informal recreation, habitat restoration and traditional community supported farming practices in the rural parish.

## Site Constraints

- Retention of existing byways and parish boundaries dividing Salisbury and Laverstock & Ford Parish at Old Castle Road, southwards towards Bishopdown.

## Land Uses and Quanta of Development

200 (not 500) new dwellings of which 40% will be affordable

## Place shaping Requirements

- Public access and ownership of the banks of the River Bourne.

## Maj/18 Longhedge near Old Sarum, Laverstock & Ford Parish

Existing Planning Consent (630+44=674 dwellings and 6ha) at Old Sarum

## Site Description

ADD: **The site lies within the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford....** and is located to the north of Salisbury City etc

To the immediate (it says east but surely it is south???) is an existing Local Plan allocation site, where detailed planning permission has been granted for **674 dwellings** (not 600 which is very wrong and lazy)

## Objectives for the development (Longhedge)

To develop a housing led mixed use development of **300** dwellings and **4 ha** of employment. *(This employment can be increased if other employment is lost at*

*Old sarum, owing to green space acquisition at the expense of the allocated employment land)*

### **Land uses and quanta of development**

Reduce size of site to allocate **300 dwellings and 4ha employment.**

Community infrastructure and approximately **4 ha** of employment land etc

### **Essential Infrastructure Requirements**

Improved cycling and pedestrian links to Old sarum and onward throughout Laverstock & Ford Parish.

Any contribution to P&R should include the ability of residents of Old sarum and Longhedge being able to use the P&R site for a reasonable fee and not a huge fare, as at present. Remember 40% social/affordable!

\*PCT: Financial contribution towards new or improved doctors and dentist surgeries.

- This is inadequate for Old Sarum/ Longhedge, given the remoteness of the settlements and the fact that 'land for a surgery' was acquired in the Old Sarum negotiations but no money nor intention to build anything. These buildings should be built under this development and funded by the developer. It is a long way to the city centre.

### **Place shaping requirements**

This is a difficult one to document!

Should Longhedge go ahead, the need is for two distinct settlements – Old sarum and Longhedge. The two should be linked by walkways but separated by open green space. Similarly, the employment land. One huge mess is not required at all. The reference to higher density in the southern part of the site seems at odds with the 'northern' element of Old sarum, which has the less dense housing!

### **Strategic Linkages**

Linkages with the existing allocated site at Old sarum to ensure that the new communities remain separate but can integrate and function as together.

### **Key delivery milestones, monitoring and review**

“....can make a significant contribution to meeting local needs through regeneration”

Not sure what that means, as 'local' is not Laverstock & Ford Parish, which has no need and 'regeneration' of what? A farm field? Prefer not to be regenerated please!

.....

## **SCHEDULE OF MINOR CHANGES TO SOUTH WILTSSHIRE CORE STRATEGY (PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT)**

**Min/005** The regional Spatial Strategy is no more and the plan is therefore flawed and unnecessary as described i.e. 12400 homes at an average 620 per year.

Given the length of time it has taken to build 177 dwellings at Old Sarum in boom time, that is an unrealistic and false target as there is no proven demand.

**Min/006** Extension to the north east of Salisbury, in the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford.

**Min/021 The 12400 homes....etc** This should be greatly reduced.

Later: **Laverstock & Ford**, Downton and wilton will be comfortable with their relationship with Salisbury.

It is certainly not at present!

**Min/023 The delivery of 12400 homes etc** Reduce number considerably.

### **Min/025**

Desired outcomes

- New developments to the north of Salisbury, **in the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford** etc

### **Min/026**

- A new, world class visitor centre for Stonehenge will have been developed.

Not according to the Government!

### **Min/030**

“This strategy seeks to enhance Salisbury’s position as a self-contained settlement etc”

This it certainly does not! It seeks to concrete over a neighbouring parish to the east and north east and is far from self contained.

### **Min/037 Core Strategy Strategic Allocations**

Hampton Park – none preferred but if retained 200 dwellings 0 ha Employment  
Longhedge 300 dwellings if retained despite being a Greenfield site. 4ha employment.

**Min/047**

My copy is black and white and the map too small to make out locations. If any of the sites marked potential for strategic growth include Laverstock village, these should be deleted and the remaining green spaces preserved as a conservation area.

**Min/048** Delete entire 'Duck Lane' row

Not sure what the significance of this is, other than it is in Laverstock and has had 125 dwellings built recently.

**Min/057** Delete comma after Laverstock

Again I have not got sight of this so deleting a comma may mean nothing other than grammar correction...but as it mentions Laverstock, I have a concern!

**Min/069**

- New secondary school capacity...longer term ASPIRATION for a new secondary school

This is an essential and not an aspiration.

- Retention of important green infrastructure to the northern slopes of **Laverstock & Ford parish** and the green lung etc

Min/075

(If retained despite being a green field)

Longhedge 300 homes and 4 ha employment

**Min/076 Core Policy 9 Old Sarum Airfield**

None of the statements are necessary and no development at Old Sarum Airfield should be permitted except that related to heritage. **New housing should not be permitted**

**All this has not been consulted upon and is not a requirement.**

**Min/098**

This clearly demonstrates that the Southern Area is the source of Salisbury's housing land and is hit twice by its own and Salisbury's demands. Unacceptable. Laverstock should be afforded the same dignity and reverence as Wilton.

.....

**SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY SUSTAINABLE APPRAISEMENT OF POSSIBLE MAJOR CHANGES TO SUBMITTED DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT MAY 2010**

**Page 41 F Other settlements in the countryside**

These smaller settlements should not fossilise, as desired by incomers and should all have exception sites for their long term community.

**Core Policy 1** – reduce the nos considerably now that the RSS has gone. There is no foundation or hope of house buying on this scale. The nos for Salisbury and in particular the ruination of Laverstock & Ford parish is ridiculously high and will also serve to alter, adversely, the character of Salisbury and its neighbour (L&F).

Southern Wiltshire Community Area omits Laverstock & Ford Parish. Most of the settlements do not identify with Downton at all.

### **Maj/11 Hampton Park Development template Site Description**

The area of land to the east of the city **and within the parish of Laverstock and Ford** etc

### **Objectives of the development**

(If retained despite representations)

To develop **200** new homes .... the existing community at **Hampton Park** (not Bishopdown Farm, which is currently in the city) ....remove the word **significant** later in the sentence.

- Protection of the strategic landscape setting of the northern slopes of Laverstock & Ford (not Salisbury, which possesses no northern slopes of its own)
- **Significant** strategic gap planning to ensure Ford retains its independent, **rural** character etc
- The delivery of a significant country park that will be handed to **the Laverstock & Ford parish** in perpetuity
- To plan for the permanent retention and enhancement of the Castle Hill/Bishopdown rural corridor, within Laverstock & Ford Parish, to link Salisbury with the surrounding chalk downs and watermeadows to enable informal recreation, habitat restoration and traditional community supported farming practices in the rural parish.

### **Site Constraints**

- The sensitive landscape at the northern slopes of **Laverstock & Ford parish** including the setting of Old sarum SAM
- Strategically important green lung at Hampton Park Down.
- Retention of Laverstock & Ford parish boundary with the city

### **Land uses quanta development**

**200** new dwellings

### **Essential Infrastructure Requirements**

**Add:** extension to The Pavilion + direct access to country park from the land adjacent to the Hampton inn and south of Green Lane, which should be kept green.

Place shaping requirements

- The layout and utility of the country park **ADD** to enable informal recreation, habitat restoration and traditional community supported farming practices in the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford, linking with the surrounding chalk downs and watermeadows.

Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect

**21** The site is close to the existing local centre at **Hampton Park**

**23** The sensitive landscape at the northern slopes of **Laverstock & Ford**

....

## **Churchfields**

### **Place shaping requirements**

No mention of high quality 4 star hotel and facilities in this development.

.....

Longhedge Page 164 to 166

Map **674** dwellings and 6ha

### **Site Description**

Add at end of first sentence, “within the parish of Laverstock & Ford”

Later in that paragraph correct 600 to 674 dwellings.

### **Land Uses and quanta of development**

300 dwellings

PCT: Should not be contribution towards but actual funding of Doctors and dentists surgery.

### **Place shaping requirements**

Should Longhedge go ahead, the need is for two distinct settlements – Old sarum and Longhedge. The two should be linked by walkways but separated by open green space. Similarly, the employment land. One huge mess is not required at all. The reference to higher density in the southern part of the site seems at odds with the ‘northern’ element of Old sarum, which has the less dense housing!

### **Strategic Linkages**

Linkages with the existing allocated site at Old sarum to ensure that the new communities remain separate but can integrate and function as together.

## **Key delivery milestones, monitoring and review**

“...can make a significant contribution to meeting local needs through regeneration”

Not sure what that means, as ‘local’ is not Laverstock & Ford Parish, which has no need and ‘regeneration’ of what? A farm field? Prefer not to be regenerated please!

## **Assessment sustainability effects**

### **13 Improve road safety and reduce congestion**

Buses run every ten minutes already along castle road, Established P&R adjacent.

These facilities are a long way from Longhedge!

.....

There appears to be lots of repetition in the various sections of the documentation and therefore a need to repeat the same replacements/comments over and over. No doubt, any changes agreed will automatically lead to a proper search for the relevant linked documentation to update it all.

Hugely time consuming, when your parish is being subjected to so much!

Cllr Ian McLennan  
Laverstock, Ford & Old Sarum Division  
Wiltshire Council