

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Cllr Ian Thorn – Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Military-Civilian Integration, Health and Wellbeing, Economic Development, Heritage, Arts and Tourism**

---

**Question (24-73Q)**

How long can the administration refuse to engage with the Melksham News?

**Response**

Leader to provide a verbal response at the meeting.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Cllr Ian Thorn – Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Military-Civilian Integration, Health and Wellbeing, Economic Development, Heritage, Arts and Tourism**

---

**Question (24-74Q)**

The site at Priestley Grove, Calne was the first site to be developed by Stone Circle. There has been no activity on the site for months. Residents have had to look at footings since the summer. At a meeting with residents, they were told that a new contractor would be appointed before the end of October and that residents would start to receive a monthly newsletter. Since then, there has been radio silence. A resident had his vehicle damaged by contractors and it is proving impossible to engage Stone Circle and their insurers. What will be done to improve the relationship between the local residents and Stone Circle and help to repair the significant reputational damage that it being done?

**Response**

It is unfortunate and unusual but not uncommon, that the contractor Gaughan Group have decided part way through the build of the nine units at Priestly Grove, that they cannot complete the project. It has taken longer than we wanted to take all the necessary steps for Stone Circle to receive the site back from Gaughan Group in order to be able to commission a new contractor. It is anticipated that process will conclude shortly. The Chairman of Stone Circle met local residents on site to explain the delay and agreed to provide further updates. The next update is anticipated in January 2025. In relation to the vehicle damage the liability rests with Gaughan Group and the appropriate contact details have been provided. Stone Circle remain committed to delivering nine new homes on site and maintaining a positive and timely dialogue with local residents.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Cllr Ian Thorn – Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Military-Civilian Integration, Health and Wellbeing, Economic Development, Heritage, Arts and Tourism**

---

**Question (24-75Q)**

Is it appropriate for the leader of the council to comment to the local press on the detail of an ongoing Wiltshire Council complaint?

**Response**

Leader to provide a verbal response at the meeting.

# Wiltshire Council

## Cabinet

19 November 2024

### Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors


#### Questions from Sally Ross

To Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management and Strategic Planning


#### Question (24-76Q)

The Council's own Topic Paper entitled Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Page 74) makes it crystal clear that there should be no development on c. 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the land proposed for development by Wyatt Homes on Site 8 (Policy 27).

Why, therefore, hasn't the sustainability appraisal been updated to reflect this change and the reduced viability of this development?



**Figure 4.20 Land South of Harnham and Land West of Coombe Road, Harnham Concept Plan**



## Response

In response to comments received from Historic England at the last consultation on the Local Plan Wiltshire Council commissioned CBA to carry out Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for seven sensitive sites, one of which was Land at South of Harnham, Salisbury (Policy 27). This is to provide further assessment for those sites.

The Sustainability Appraisal has already assessed proposals for the site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, which has been approved for submission. The CBA HIA work is an additional piece of evidence. Both the Sustainability Appraisal and this additional work will be considered during the Examination.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Andrew Wheeler**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-77Q)**

**Subject: Brownfield sites within Salisbury**

Given the demand for new housing and the Governments 'Brownfield First' policy, does Wiltshire Council intend to initiate a new 'call for new brownfield sites' and, if so, when and will these be considered as part of the housing allocation in the draft Local Plan?

**Response**

Formal 'call for site' exercises tend to be done at the start of a local plan process. However, sites can be submitted to the council at any time through the open call for sites on the council's website that can be accessed via: [Monitoring and evidence - Wiltshire Council](#). The information collected is used to inform neighbourhood plans and will inform the preparation of future local plans.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Andrew Wheeler**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-78Q)**

**Premature Development**

Does the Council agree that the consultation initiated by Persimmon Homes for the early development on Land South of Downton (Policy 26) is premature given that the site has not yet been approved as part of the local plan making process?

**Response**

The council has little, if any, say on when developers chose to undertake consultations on sites they are promoting to inform a future planning application. However, they are encouraged to respect the plan led process particularly where proposals relate to sites in an emerging plan.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Matthew Ravenhill**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-79Q)**

**Statement of Common Ground – Wyatt Homes & Wiltshire Council.**

Would the Council share a copy of the Statement of Common Ground that has been worked up between Wyatt Homes and Wiltshire Council for the development at Land south of Harnham/west of Coombe Road (Policy 27/Policy 28)?

If this cannot be shared at this time, please can it explain why, and when it will be available for public scrutiny?

**Response**

At the October Cabinet meeting, Agenda Item 7 'Wiltshire Local Plan Review - Submission of Draft Plan' paragraph 23 of the report explained that Statements of Common Ground are being prepared with site promoters to help demonstrate site delivery. The intention is to make these available on the council's website alongside all relevant documentation associated with the Plan's submission to the Secretary of State. This will be towards the end of the year.



**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Joanna Dingley**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-80Q)**

The proposed development of 310 houses on Grade 2/3A best and most versatile agricultural land south of Harnham, Salisbury (Policy 27 & Policy 28 in the Regulation 19 version of the draft Local Plan) would have a devastating impact on the environment, especially given:

- The development is in the setting of the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape; a designated area of outstanding natural beauty;
- The development sits within the Chalk River Valley Landscape Character Area, as determined by the Wiltshire Land Character Assessment;
- The location and setting of a designated scheduled monument and archaeological remains adjacent to, and on, Site 8.
- The impact on the River Ebble and sensitive water receptors that, if impacted, could result in increased flooding of local settlements.
- The urbanising effect and consequent impact on the townscape setting on the City.

Given the environmental impact of this planned development, the Council is asked to confirm whether a 'screening opinion' has been asked for/undertaken in accordance with Section 6 of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations)?

If so, whether this 'screening opinion' could be made public.

**Response**

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) does not apply to the preparation of a Local Plan. EIA does form part of the planning application process but only applies to certain types of development that fall within the scope of the Regulations.

Developers have the option to submit a request for a Screening Opinion in advance of submitting a planning application. For certain types of developments, as set out in the regulations, the local planning authority will carry out its own screening. Requests

for EIA Screening are made public on the planning register, along with the council's decision.

To date, no request for a Screening Opinion has been received.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Joanna Dingley**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-81Q)**

Given that Sites 8 and 9 (Policy 27 & Policy 28) sit within the setting of the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape (formerly AONB) and are within a Wiltshire Council designated Special Landscape Area, why was the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape not consulted as part of the Local Plan preparation?

Does this omission impact the Council's legal obligation under the Duty to Cooperate?

**Response**

With specific reference to the legal duty to cooperate, it is important to note that National Landscape Boards are not 'prescribed bodies' for the purposes of Section 33(A)(c) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. That said, and in accord with the duty to further the purposes of the designated landscape, the Cranborne Chase National Landscape Board has been consulted throughout the preparation of the Local Plan.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Tim Guy**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management and Strategic Planning**

---

**Question (24-83Q)**

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 makes it clear that the Regulation 22(1)(c) Consultation Statement should set out “how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account” (Para iv).

Given that Sites 8 & 9 (Policy 27 & Policy 28) were not consulted on at the Regulation 18 stage (the 2021 ‘Planning for Salisbury’ document makes no mention of Site 8 or 9), surely the Council should have acknowledged and responded to the 2,800 Representations submitted by the Harnham/Salisbury Community regarding Sites 8 & 9 in their Regulation 22(1)(c) Consultation Statement as this was the first time that a consultation response regarding these sites had been received? Instead, the Council response simply outlines a Statement of Common Ground that is being developed between the Council Wyatt Homes and Wyatt Homes.

Given this, does the Council feel that it has complied with its Statement of Community Involvement?

**Response**

The Council has complied with relevant regulations and its published Statement of Community Involvement throughout the process of preparing the Local Plan.

The regulations require two stages of consultation. At Regulation 18 the consultation seeks views on the subject of the local plan and invites people to submit representations on what a local plan should contain. At Regulation 19 stage, people are invited to inspect the ‘publication’ version of the Local Plan and submit comments in advance of the Plan being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.

Regulation 22 does not require the council to respond to each of the representations received through the Regulation 19 consultation. However, this does provide a summary of representations that have been made and this will help inform the key issues for consideration at the examination.

At examination, an independent planning inspector will consider the proposed site allocations against the requirement for new development, taking account of

comments made by the local community at the different stages of the consultation process.

A copy of the representation summary (A), the Councils response (B), and the list of issues raised by the Community (C) is provided below for ease of reference. B and C are taken from the Councils Regulation 22(1)(c) document.

## A. Representations Submitted – Comparison

(<https://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/kpse/event/6565FF19-695C-4721-B19F-3226D666441E/peoplesubmissions>)

| Processed Items   |    |                 |           |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------|
| List By: <input checked="" type="radio"/> Consultation Point <input type="radio"/> Submission |    |                 |           |
| <input type="text"/>  |    |                 |           |
| Consultation Point  | AZ | Respondent Type | Responses |
| Policy 20 Land North of the A3102   |    | 5  5            | 10        |
| Chippenham Rural Area   |    | 33  26          | 59        |
| Strategy for Salisbury Housing Market Area  |    | 15  9           | 24        |
| Policy 21 Salisbury new community   |    | 52  19          | 71        |
| Salisbury Principal Settlement  |    | 10  3           | 13        |
| Policy 22 Salisbury Principal Settlement  |    | 442  22         | 464       |
| Policy 23 Land NE of Old Sarum, Salisbury   |    | 13  3           | 16        |
| Policy 24 Land at Netherhampton Road Garden Centre  |    | 25  1           | 26        |
| Policy 25 Land North of the Beehive Park & Ride, Old Sarum                                    |    | 9  2            | 11        |
| Policy 26 Land North of Downton Road  |    | 94  8           | 102       |
| Policy 27 Land South of Harnham   |    | 1434  5         | 1439      |
| Policy 28 Land West of Coombe Road, Harnham   |    | 1390  4         | 1394      |
| Policy 29 Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, South Salisbury                            |    | 45  4           | 49        |
| Policy 30 Land East of Church Road, Laverstock  |    | 50  3           | 53        |
| Policy 31 Salisbury Central Area  |    | 7  2            | 9         |

## B. Council's Response:

### Policy 27: Land South of Harnham

A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is underway with the site promoter of this allocation, Wyatt Homes, that will provide contextual information and focus on key issues relevant to the site. This will aim to provide commentary on any areas of disagreement as well as establish common ground on matters in principle. This will also contain housing trajectory information. To inform the examination process and assist the Inspector, SOCGs will, where it is considered appropriate to do so, present suggested changes that parties determine could be made by the Inspector. This SOCG includes Policy 28 Land West of Coombe Road as both allocations are being delivered by the same developer and are adjacent to one another. Key topics this SOCG will aim to cover include the requirement for an approved comprehensive masterplan prior to a planning application, status of the Concept Plan, prescriptive requirement for early years education provision, SANG delivery and requirement for self-build housing. The SOCG also includes information on SANG delivery which this allocation is required to deliver through Policy 29.

### Main issues: Salisbury Principal Settlement

Given the comments received on the location of the site in relation to the National Landscape, matters relevant to the site will also look to be covered within a SOCG that is being prepared between Wiltshire Council and the three National Landscape boards (Cotswold, Cranborne Chase and North Wessex Downs).

### Policy 28: Land West of Coombe Road

A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is underway with the site promoter of this allocation, Wyatt Homes, that will provide contextual information and focus on key issues relevant to the site. This will aim to provide commentary on any areas of disagreement as well as establish common ground on matters in principle. This will also contain housing trajectory information. To inform the examination process and assist the Inspector, SOCGs will, where it is considered appropriate to do so, present suggested changes that parties determine could be made by the Inspector. This SOCG includes Policy 27 Land South of Harnham as both allocations are being delivered by the same developer and are adjacent to one another. Key topics this SOCG will aim to cover include the requirement for an approved comprehensive masterplan prior to a planning application, status of the Concept Plan, requirement for provision of multiple play areas, requirement for provision of allotments and SANG delivery. The SOCG also includes information on SANG delivery which this allocation is required to deliver through Policy 29.

Given the comments received on the location of the site in relation to the National Landscape, matters relevant to the site will also look to be covered within a SOCG that is being prepared between Wiltshire Council and the three National Landscape boards (Cotswold, Cranborne Chase and North Wessex Downs).

## C. Issues Raised by Community

| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)   | Respondent(s)  |
|--|--|
| <b>Statutory consultees</b>  |  |
| <b>Whether SANG area in Policy 29 has been secured:</b> This is unclear from the Policy 27 wording. If it has been secured then the policy should clarify that a contribution to the SANG will be required. If not then there remains uncertainty as to whether the scheme will be deliverable. The Policy and or supporting text should specify that the necessary SANG provision for the development must be secured prior to commencement of the development and the facility open and available to the public by first occupation. The allocation includes the Woodbury Ancient Village Scheduled Ancient Monument as green infrastructure. While Natural England has no objection to this approach, confirmation is needed as to whether this area will be used as SANG and whether this will be in addition to the adjacent area of SANG / Country Park proposed by Policy 29. | Natural England.   |
| <b>Green infrastructure and green space buffers:</b> Natural England supports the inclusion of 14.04 hectares of green infrastructure within the concept plan along with minimum 40 m green space buffers but recommends these requirements are set out in the policy as a minimum area requirement for the scheme.  | Natural England.   |
| <b>Has a HIA been undertaken and available to consider:</b> There is significant archaeology associated with the Woodbury scheduled monument. Policy 27 should include a similar condition to the Ende Burgh Barrow caveat in Policy 23 to ensure that the layout of the development is designed to avoid significant features and ensure development positively responds.   | Historic England.  |
| <b>Groundwater and surface water issues:</b> Some of these sites will be experiencing higher than usual groundwater levels since the flooding in the River Avon in January. Therefore promoters of these sites should gather information over this year as good baseline data. Additionally, there may be a requirement for betterment on the surface water runoff rates due to identified downstream risk, on which the LPA should seek advice from the LLFA.   | Environment Agency.  |
| <b>Greenfield/Brownfield development</b>   |  |
| <b>The Local Plan lacks justification for proposing the development of new housing on greenfield land:</b> (para 3.41 states that development of small sites gives protection to greenfield site and the land and the development should be minimised), whilst excluding available and suitable brownfield land within Salisbury, including the old Quarry, Gas Works, the Maltings & Central Car Park, Churchfields, park and ride sites, Brown Street/Salt Lane car parks. This will destroy the natural greenfield lands within Salisbury, including the Lime Kiln reserve.   | Individual x230; Salisbury City Council; Harnham Neighbourhood Association; Harnham Housing Steering Group; Cycling Opportunities Group Salisbury. |

**Housing figures**

| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)   | Respondent(s)   |
|--|---|
| <b>Housing figures:</b> (200-300) for the Maltings and Central car park have not been included in the housing allocation for Salisbury. If they were then WC would not need to develop on Sites 8&9.   | Individuals x80.  |
| <b>Housing figures:</b> WC has ignored Salisbury's Neighbourhood Plan which states that between 2,250 and 2,850 'windfall' homes could be delivered over the 18-year Plan period, meaning you wouldn't need to build on greenfield land, such as that on Site 8. Wiltshire Council has only made provision for 350 homes in the Local Plan over 15 years whereas the number should be nearer 1,000. Salisbury Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan says that over 770 homes were developed on brownfield land over the last 5 years. However, Wiltshire Council only have 60 homes in the Local Plan over 15 years.  | Individuals x110; Harnham Housing Steering Group.   |
| <b>Housing figures:</b> The allocation of large-scale employment growth areas in Salisbury to the north, such as Porton, Fugglestone, Old Sarum, and Quidhampton Quarry, raises questions about the suitability of sites in the south Harnham area to serve these employment hubs. To align with forecasted employment growth and promote sustainable development, it is recommended to consider a reduction in planned housing numbers for Salisbury by 5-10%, equivalent to 225-450 homes.   | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Military housing:</b> Wiltshire Council should work with the military to utilise empty military properties.   | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Affordable Housing Provision / Employment</b>   |   |
| <b>Affordable homes provision:</b> Site 8 and 9 will only deliver, at the most, 40% of the requirement for social and affordable homes needed to accommodate those for whom the need for housing exists, with the largest proportion of housing (60%) being better quality and more expensive homes attracting buyers from outside the area who will commute to their place of employment.   | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Employment:</b> Salisbury has low unemployment (2.3%) and the highest demand is for lower-skilled or entry-level jobs in sectors such as retail and hospitality. These jobs will not provide the salaries for the majority of homes proposed on sites 8 and 9.  | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Employment:</b> Plan needs to deliver homes aligned to job growth as outlined in Policy 21. Sites 8 and 9 do not deliver homes close to areas of "job growth". Homes need to be located North of Salisbury where transport links etc are promoting job growth but the Plan fails to identify employment opportunities. In addition, "New homes need to be delivered at appropriate, sustainable locations and MUST be supported by necessary improvements in Infrastructure." Development of sites 8 and 9 do not meet these criteria, the sites are remote from diverse employment, requiring car transport, non-vehicular access to the City is not practical, and there are nor realistic plans to significantly improve the infrastructure in the area.                           | Individuals x20.  |
| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)   | Respondent(s)   |
| <b>Employment and transport/Climate:</b> Are the sites in south Harnham well-placed to support these job hubs given the travel distances? There is no guarantee sustainable transport will be used and so what implications does this have for transportation infrastructure and its alignment with the Government's Net Zero Strategy for promoting cycling and walking to work?  | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Traffic and congestion</b>  |   |
| <b>Traffic:</b> Development of the site would cause more traffic, congestion and air pollution, including at Harnham, Britford, Homington, Odstock, Nunton, Coombe Bissett, Rockbourne, Downton, Southampton Road, College roundabout, Old Blandford Road etc. / concern about impacts on emergency service response times as a result of increased traffic / It is unlikely that 10% of journeys will be made using sustainable transport or that 23% of journeys will be made without using a car / There is a lack of detailed evidence about improvements to Harnham Gyratory (which will be at 97% capacity according to Transport Evidence base) and nearby road networks, as well as no evidence of plans to address the subsequent increase in traffic as a result of sites 8&9. | Individuals x280; Harnham Neighbourhood Association; Salisbury City Council; Downton Parish Council; Harnham Housing Steering Group; Cycling Opportunities Group Salisbury. |
| <b>Preliminary road improvement plans:</b> called the "Salisbury Transport Strategy Refresh," have emerged. However, they fall short in several ways: they don't address traffic congestion adequately, neglect the impact of Sites 8 and 9, have a limited planning horizon of 2026 instead of 2038, and lack funding. Given limitations and funding gaps, the integration of Sites 8 and 9 into the plan is questioned.  | Individuals x10.  |
| <b>Transport infrastructure funding</b>  |   |
| <b>Transport Infrastructure Funding:</b> The proposal to improve the Harnham Gyratory will cost around £19 million, which is not affordable given the available funding of £1.5 million.   | Individuals x100.   |
| <b>Transport Infrastructure Funding:</b> The Infrastructure and Mitigation Requirements for the site proposed under Policy 27 fails to include funding of a scheme at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter St roundabout to provide extras vehicular capacity, bus priority and cycling and walking provision to LTN 1/20 standard. There is a notable absence of detailed and costed plans for crucial amenities within Policy 27. Specifically, there is no provision for accessible primary school places, safe cycle paths, significant road improvements, or a funded regular bus service for these sites. The IDP does not contain deliverable schemes within the plan period to support housing growth in Harnham.   | Individuals x20.  |
| <b>Highway access and safety</b>   |   |
| <b>Highway access and safety:</b> According to the Sustainability Appraisal (Site 8, Objective 11) access "may not be achievable" and that a second access is required, but the Local Plan seems to have over looked this, as access to sites 8&9 is currently proposed as either a roundabout or traffic lights on Coombe Road (A354) on a blind bend, downhill. The Local Plan and Sustainability Assessment thus present no justification that Site 8 is  | Individuals x250; Harnham Housing Steering Group; Salisbury City Council.   |

| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)  |
|---|--|
| deliverable without secondary access. Concern that vehicular access would involve a new direct access to the national primary route network/major road network, not permitted under WLP Policy 72. There is also concern over pedestrian access across Coombe Road, where the footpath is unsighted. This is dangerous and will likely be an accident hotspot. Additionally, the Appraisal indicates that a roundabout is feasible only if both Sites 8 and 9 are developed together; otherwise, traffic lights will be necessary. Both options will exacerbate traffic congestion on the A354 and the Gyratory. Development of Sites 8&9 would mean that many, notably students, would have to travel from one side of the city through the centre or around the most congested and unsafe arteria routes. Walkability/travel of these routes has also not been considered with the steep hill, despite being "reasonably well connected". There are also no plans to provide safe or sustainable travel, cycle lanes or pushchair friendly, safe routes to school from the top of Harnham Hill. |  |
| <b>Sustainable transport</b>  |  |
| <b>Sustainable transport:</b> Policy 27 has not considered the needs of everyone who uses public transport. A bus service which runs every 2 hours Monday-Friday with a restricted service on Saturday and nothing on Sunday is not sufficient to fulfil their needs. In addition, local buses do not run until after 9am and there are no public transport services on the A354. The Local Plan has not, therefore, fully explored opportunities to promote public transport use thus overestimating sustainable travel modes as per para 104 of NPPF.   | Individuals x30; Salisbury City Council; Harnham Housing Steering Group. |
| <b>Sustainable transport:</b> Wiltshire Council's expectation of a minimum 23% non car mode share across the county appears implausible, given the substantial reliance on cars to reach employment areas, especially for those commuting from rural or non-public transport-connected regions. Sites 8 & 9 are too remote from the city centre, supermarkets, schools, GPs, dentists and employment hubs and it is unlikely people will walk or cycle as is the case with the residents who already live near those locations.   | Individuals x100   |
| <b>Sustainable transport:</b> In order to be consistent with NPPF paragraphs 103-111, and the draft policy 71 "Transport and New Developments" we consider that a bus service operating at least every 30 minutes Monday-Saturday represents a reasonable baseline level of service to present a relevant choice. This approach is broadly consistent with the Salisbury Transport Strategy. Broadly all these objectives are achievable in the proposed allocation.  | Go South Coast Ltd.  |
| <b>Transport Evidence Base</b>  |  |
| <b>Transport Evidence Base:</b> Modelling uses county-wide projections rather than traffic counts for Salisbury, raising concerns about the accuracy of data. Additionally, the absence of recent counts for New Harnham Road and Netherhampton Road in the evidence underlines potential gaps in the information provided. The Transport Evidence Base 2022's modelling data is criticised for weaknesses, as it fails to adhere to Department for Transport (DfT) modelling guidance, rendering it unreliable for drawing conclusions, such as how the model  | Individuals x30.   |
| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)  |
| responds to traffic congestion. There are concerns that there is conflicting information between the Local Plan, Transport Evidence Base, and Revised Spatial Strategy 2023 regarding whether the specific impact of Sites 8 and 9 has been incorporated into the traffic modelling thus far.   |  |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts</b>  |  |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> There is no indication within the Plan as to how environmental impacts will be mitigated. Development of sites 8&9 will result in the loss of natural features, wildlife and habitats, protected trees and increase noise and light pollution and reduce air quality. The Lime Kiln Area is a frequent dog walking location will be impacted by development. Development will impact the setting of the National Landscape as an International Dark Skies Reserve and remove the natural green space adjacent to Lime Kiln and the Plan lacks evidence on the necessary mitigation measures for this. The proposals for Sites 8&9 do not comply with the Government Guidance in 'A Green Future - Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment', or national policy which requires local planning policies to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. There is concern over the lack of biodiversity and ecological evidence used to inform the site selection process and concept plans.                           | Individuals x130; Harnham Housing Steering Group.                        |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> Why do Policies 27 and 28 stipulate a biodiversity net gain of only 10% for Sites 8 & 9, while Policy 89 necessitates a 20% gain?   | Individuals x10.   |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> Concerns that a SANG cannot be effectively established given the guidance from Wessex Archaeology which limits the use of the SANG to activities like fencing, gardening, and tree planting   | Individuals x10.   |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The inclusion of Policy 27 (Site 8) in the Local plan is not consistent with Policy 91, or with the NPPF Section 185 where it states that planning policies should 'b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason'. Development of sites 8&9 does not conserve the natural beauty of the National Landscape and their setting, and therefore conflicts with Policy 91 and the NPPF   | Individuals x10.   |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> Concerns that given the sloping terrain of the site, sites 8&9 will be the first large development viewable from the Ebble Valley, National Landscape, and Dark Skies reserve, which has not been considered  | Individuals x10, Salisbury City Council.                                 |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The Plan fails to establish the correct distance to the National Landscape, which questions if the impact of Site 8 to the National Landscape has been accurately assessed. The boundary of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape is the River Ebble, which is within 1km of the southern boundary of Site 8 (instead of the erroneous 2km stated within the Local Plan). This development   | Individuals x 30, Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership.                      |



| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)                            |
|---|--|
| will therefore likely have a significant impact on the National Landscape. Policies 27 & 28 should be removed as there is no evidence that they can be delivered in line with Policy 92. It is concerning that sites identified in policies 27 and 28 have been put forward without prior discussion with the National Landscape Partnership. Both would bring development further over the ridge south and south-westwards towards this nationally important National Landscape. The land in question across both sites slopes towards this National Landscape. The effect of that slope is to expose development on that slope to the National Landscape, and makes the integration and screening of development by ground moving, tree and shrub planting more difficult to achieve and to maintain. The potential housing will appear as a substantial urban expansion above the fringing trees on the southern and south-western sides |  |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> There is no indication as to how WC can ensure that the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) is ready before the first residence is occupied in these developments or any plans to position a large car park to accommodate the expected daily visitors to the SANG. In addition, how can WC ensure the SANG car park remains available for SANG visitors, rather than just becoming a free alternative. In addition, there is no plan for the car park within the proposed SANG and there is limited space available to build it without impacting on the Woodbury Ancient Monument  | Individuals x10.                         |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> There is currently no phosphorus mitigation plan for Sites 8&9 despite Policy 27 stating development must include measures aimed at neutralising the levels of phosphates flowing into the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) to improve water quality. Additionally, the lie of the land is such that any phosphates not neutralised will find their way before any other river into the trout stream River Ebble, which is very picturesque and attractive to walkers as well  | Individuals x10.                         |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> How can the conclusion that Site 8 & 9 have an "ordinary" landscape be drawn from a desktop review without field study? The elevated landscape is continuous with the Area of Natural Beauty (National Landscape) landscape, so how can it be considered 'ordinary'?  | Individuals x10.                         |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The allocation is inconsistent with the requirement to conserve the historic landscape setting of Salisbury. The proposals would not improve the urban edge and countryside transition on this approach into Salisbury, as this is already established by a belt of mature trees which very effectively screens views of the urban edge. This transitional edge will be lost.   | Individuals x10.                         |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The land is identified as a Special Landscape Area and is in the sensitive catchment of the River Avon  | Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership.        |
| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)                            |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The Avon Valley Path, a regional trail, currently passes through farmland but the experience of using that route for some 2km would be significantly changed passing alongside a major housing development. Similarly, the Public Right of Way heading from Harnham south-westwards towards this National Landscape though open fields would have development on all sides. The concept plan, Fig 4.20 p108, does not indicate how any of those issues above would be overcome  | Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership.        |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> Policy 29 as currently drafted refers to providing Natural Greenspace as mitigating adverse effects on sites in the New Forest, some distance away and on the far side of the Avon Valley, but there is no proposed mitigation or compensation for development in the setting of Cranborne Chase National Landscape which is much closer  | Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership.        |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The provision of the SANG with a car park at an unspecified location will encourage travel across Salisbury by car and will attract additional visitors to what is a fragile habitat. No justification has been provided in the LPR documentation about how impacts on Lime Kiln Down have been taken into account or how potential harm to this habitat will be mitigated  | Salisbury City Council; Individuals x10. |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> It is unclear where the proposed car park for the SANG, which this site relies on, is to be located.  | Individuals x10.                         |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The SANG proposed for this site consists, in part, of the Lime Kiln County Wildlife Site which supports a high range of species, particularly orchids and butterflies. The LPR wording is incorrect regarding the ownership of this site. It is managed by volunteers under the auspices of Salisbury City Council, which owns the central portion of the CWS, with Wiltshire Council owning the rest. This site is relatively small, highly vulnerable and will be subjected to vastly increased recreational pressure which will place unsustainable pressure on the CWS  | Salisbury City Council.                  |
| <b>Environmental, landscape and biodiversity impacts:</b> The other part of the SANG is linked to the Woodbury Ancient Villages archaeological site which lies mainly on the other side of Odstock Road and is agricultural land, already well used by walkers, so classifying it as recreational space confers no additional public benefit. Salisbury's emerging Neighbourhood Plan aspires to see the green sites along this higher edge of Harnham retained as part of a wildlife corridor or nature reserve and potential receptacle for biodiversity net gain, retaining this benefit within the city limits. In the context of this small CWS, green infrastructure should not be confused with provision for play or sport, and habitat improvement will be difficult to combine with increased public access   | Salisbury City Council.                  |
| <b>Infrastructure</b>   |  |

| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)                                    |
|---|--|
| <b>School Provision:</b> How will the Plan guarantee adequate capacity at the on-site nursery and where will additional primary school place be made available if they cannot be accommodated elsewhere. Wiltshire Council's draft School Places Strategy 2023-2027 gives the planned capacity of this school as 2 form entry i.e. 420 places for 7 year groups. Sites 8 and 9 would therefore require an immediate and currently unfunded 23% expansion in school capacity. Neither the SA nor the Local Plan present any evidence that this is deliverable. There are no detailed plans as to where the nursery will be situated. There are no detailed plans of the height of the proposed housing/nursery as well as the required type of construction for the Sites 8/9 dwellings. Will each have adequate provisions for mid 21 <sup>st</sup> /22 <sup>nd</sup> century living, i.e., be eco-friendly, have solar panel roofing and electric vehicle charging points, heat pumps etc? and will this be restricted to that required by Salisbury City's bylaws etc? Education funding should be 100% and paid upfront into an ESCROW account | Individual x40.                                  |
| <b>School provision:</b> There is a lack of clarity about school place availability for the c700 houses currently under construction in Harnham, in addition to new planned development. It is also unclear when new school places will be required and how they will be funded   | Individuals x10.                                 |
| <b>Allotments:</b> The policy refers to the provision of an unstated number of new allotments but this is not reflected on the accompanying Figure 4.2, creating inconsistency.   | Individuals x10.                                 |
| <b>Other Infrastructure provision:</b> Currently, there is no major supermarket, Medical/Health Centre nor Secondary School on the south side of the City. The scale of the proposals would put increased pressure on local services, such as GP surgeries, Salisbury District Hospital and schools (which are already near/at capacity) without any proposals to expand these or where funding would come from   | Individuals x20.                                 |
| <b>Water/sewerage</b>   |  |
| <b>Water/sewerage:</b> The area south of Portland Avenue will require the provision of septic tank drainage as there are currently no mains sewerage on that side of the hill. This will require major storage facilities and regular emptying, increasing vehicle movements in the area and also increases the risk of spillage, overflows and possible contamination. The Local Plan additionally lacks adequate details regarding who will cover the costs and the economic feasibility of installing the required pumping facilities to transport a substantial amount of sewage over an extensive distance   | Individuals x30.                                 |
| <b>Water/sewerage:</b> The Local Plan lacks clarity regarding the adequacy of surface runoff provision to avert local flooding and its repercussions on the Ebble Valley. Wiltshire Council has not taken flooding into consideration   | Individuals x30.                                 |
| <b>Water/sewerage :</b> The Environmental Agency regard this area as "seriously water stressed", building on the site will add further water stress, making it unsustainable. Yet the list of 'Infrastructure and Mitigation Requirements' in Policy 27 omits the need identified in SA Policy 27 (Para 6.29) for off-site infrastructure   | Individuals x20.                                 |
| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)                                    |
| reinforcement for water supply and foul drainage, if this is the case, consideration of this matter should have taken place long before the WDPlan has got to this point, especially considering the site is in close proximity to one of the internationally recognised chalk streams, the River Ebble   |  |
| <b>Water/sewerage:</b> The main part of the development at site 8 would be at its westerly end which slopes to the south and west towards the Ebble valley. It is envisaged that foul water and sewage would be pumped to one of two possible points on the main sewage network at the junction of Andrews Way and Coombe Road or the roundabout at the junction of Odstock road and Coombe road. Both are over 500 metres and would require a new pumping facility of sufficient capacity to take sewage for nearly 300 houses uphill which require some power and necessarily be costly and take time to construct. Assurances would have to be given that no backing up or overflow could occur in the future  | Individuals x20.                                 |
| <b>Energy</b>   |  |
| <b>Energy:</b> Demand in and around Salisbury is already high in relation to the capacity of the electricity grid. Building on Sites 8 & 9 will significantly add to the stress on the electricity grid and energy supply, which is critical for all future development. The move to "net zero" moves energy requirements to electrical power, which is not recognised in the plan. There is also no indication as to who will fund this or how it will be provided   | Individual x10.                                  |
| <b>Community Engagement</b>   |  |
| <b>Community Engagement:</b> Wiltshire Council have failed to comply with its own Statement of Community Involvement by not engaging with residents across Harnham and Salisbury impacted by the proposed development of sites 8&9 / previous consultations did not propose this site as a preferred site / the consultation process has not been user friendly   | Individual x260; Harnham Housing Steering Group. |
| <b>Community Engagement:</b> The leader of Wiltshire Council(WC) stated that objections to the Plan must be based on evidence provided in the Plan (Public meeting on 20.09.2023). This task is very difficult when such evidence as exists in the Plan and its associated documents is scanty, frequently contradictory and difficult to access. Freedom of Information requests have been met with partial responses, suggesting the information does not exist, or with the response that the information cannot be supplied as it only exists in draft. This raises the question of whether the Plan can be adequately responded to if it is incomplete and lacks supporting evidence. Additionally, only 10% of FOI requests have been responded to  | Individual x40.                                  |
| <b>Duty to Cooperate</b>  |  |
| Key issues raised (Policy 27 Land South of Harnham, Salisbury)  | Respondent(s)                                    |
| <b>Duty to Cooperate:</b> Wiltshire Council have not engaged with Salisbury City Council - there is no coherence with the Salisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan and no engagement with Natural England, as evidenced by FOI response from Natural England, with regards to sites 8&9. Equally, there has been a failure to answer 90 % of FOI requests   | Individual x20.                                  |
| <b>Duty to Cooperate:</b> Evidence has been provided by Natural England from a FOI request that Wiltshire Council has not engaged with them. We are now at Regulation 14 stage of the process with no engagement with Natural England which is a legal requirement. The process should be stopped until a review has been carried out as to why this has happened and to enable proper engagement   | Individual x20.                                  |

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 5 – Public Participation and Questions from Councillors**

**Questions from Tim Guy**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management  
and Strategic Planning**

---

**Statement**

**Local Plan - Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**

The 'Review and Update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (September 2023 Version 0.4)' - the 'IDP' - that supported the Regulation 19 consultation of the draft Local Plan identified the infrastructure needs across Wiltshire over the Local Plan period to 2038. This identified the need for 'A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements' and 'A36 Southampton Road Upgrades' to support Local Plan delivery. These schemes were estimated to cost £17.495m for the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' (of which £1.552m had been secured) and £6m for 'Southampton Road' (no contributions had been secured).

This document updated costs for the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' set out in the 'January 2021 Wiltshire Local Plan Transport Review (Appendix D4 – Salisbury Junctions SOBC<sup>[1]</sup>)', which stated that: "*The proposed A338 Southern Salisbury junction improvements (Exeter Street and Harnham Gyratory) **will help to mitigate the impacts of additional traffic from new development to the south of the city***" (para 4.2).

In March 2022, the Department for Transport removed the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' scheme from the Department's Major Road Network & Large Local Major programme following advice from the Western Gateway Sub-National Transport Body (STB), having consulted Wiltshire Council, that a better scheme could be delivered. Wiltshire Council confirmed:

*"Wiltshire Council has developed proposals for the A338 junctions in Salisbury, but it is considered that there is potential for a better scheme which could be progressed using existing developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding and potentially in conjunction with National Highways. This would provide an improvement that represents better value for money, reduces delays, and reflects the results of the public consultation held on the proposals last year. To this end Wiltshire Council and the STB have no objection to the A338 Southern Salisbury Improvements scheme being removed from the MRN programme."<sup>[2]</sup>*

It is therefore not clear why Wiltshire Council included details and costs for the 'A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements' programme in the September 2023 IDP when this £17.495m programme was cancelled and replaced by a smaller scheme in March 2022.

### **Salisbury Junction Improvements**

The 'Salisbury Junction Improvements'<sup>[3]</sup> web page confirmed the cancellation of this larger scheme in preferred to a smaller one. Under the heading "**How will the Scheme improve conditions for motorists?**" the response states: *"The scheme will accommodate the increase in traffic from currently identified developments in the area up to 2026, and journey times through the junctions should be reduced."* The webpage confirms that costs are estimated at £2.5m which would be funded from developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Under the heading "**What about traffic from proposed new housing growth from the Local Plan Process?**" the response states: *"The current scheme has been designed and assessed on the basis of **known development and the current Core strategy**. Future development proposed through the Local Plan will be subject to their own series of tests through the planning process and will be required to provide their own necessary mitigation."*

It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the current 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' plan does not accommodate planned growth in housing developments associated with the Local Plan to 2038; namely 220 houses in Britford (Policy 26) and 310 Houses in Harnham (Policy 27 & Policy 28).

### **Salisbury Transport Strategy (June 2018) / Salisbury Transport Strategy – Draft Strategy Refresh 2018 (3 July 2018)**

The Salisbury Transport Strategy<sup>[4]</sup> / Draft Strategy Refresh<sup>[5]</sup> appear to be the current strategy for transport in Salisbury but both documents appear very out of date. It is assumed that the capital costs for the strategy refresh of £32.39m (Para 4.8) does not reflect the scaling down of the Salisbury junction improvements from £17.495m to £2.5m.

### **Local Plan – Transport Evidence Base (May 2023)**

The Transport Evidence Base (May 2023) – a supporting document to the Regulation 19 version of the draft Local Plan – identified the 'A338 Salisbury Junctions' as an "additional area of concern". It confirmed that; *"The A354 approach to Harnham Junction has shown an increase in V/C (Vehicle Capacity) from 85% to 97% between the Core and DM2b scenarios" (Para 4.4.3)<sup>[6]</sup>*. The Evidence Base confirmed that; *"Severe impact on roads or junctions might be expected where values exceed 85%" (Para 3.5)* and *"85% represents a typical allowable threshold for development impacts."*

Given that the Evidence Base was developed as part of the Local Plan process, it is assumed that the projected 97% capacity takes into account the improvements, to some roads, resultant from the implementation of the £2.5m 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' set out above.

### **Local Plan – Transport Topic Paper (October 2024)**

The Transport Topic Paper and supporting Appendices are impenetrable to the average resident. A 'plain English version' would help residents of Harnham and Salisbury understand the impact of planned traffic growth associated with the Local Plan to 2038, and whether the mitigations planned will reduce vehicle capacity to acceptable levels (i.e., <85%).

The Transport Topic Paper states that: *“sizeable financial contributions have been secured against development at Netherhampton Road, which directly impacts upon the junctions”*. (Para 7.31). It also states that, at Para 7.37: *“The conclusions flowing from the model illustrate that the enhancements at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street junctions are required to accommodate and mitigate the draft Local Plan proposals around Salisbury. **Whilst the enhancements do not fully mitigate the increase in traffic** - i.e., to mimic current levels of delay and queuing, the relative increases are **within reasonable parameters**.”* It is not clear what “reasonable parameters” means.

However, Appendix A to the Transport Topic Paper states that V/C for the A354 (Coombe Road) on approach to the Odstock Road junction will increase from **86% to 102%**. It also states that: *“**Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabout are already predicted to be operating at capacity in the Core scenario, which will likely worsen with increased demand associated with the LPR (2024)**”* (Para 6.4.3).

Figure 6-13 provides the illustration and shows all roads around the Harnham Gyratory at or near 100% capacity with the local plan growth:

The assumption that ambulances will use sirens and lights to bypass queues appears very optimistic (Para 7.40) especially since they need to traverse the busiest of roads that feed Harnham Gyratory.

The Topic Paper concludes (Para 7.41) that; *“It is clear that the implementation of the Local plan will require works at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street junctions to accommodate the increase in traffic flows. However, the increase in traffic also illustrates the increased pressure that the localised area of Salisbury network will be under in 2038 and hence there will be **an impetus to implement further works and incentives associated with the current and renewed Salisbury Transport Strategy**”*. It is not clear what these further works are or when they will be delivered?

Appendix B to the Topic paper provides the journey time, and queue and delay analysis for the Harnham Gyratory and feeder roads for the Local Plan growth and Salisbury Hospital HEAT<sup>[7]</sup> programme to 2038. The analysis concludes that both AM and PM peak journey times, for the 2038 DS2 scenario (i.e. Predicted traffic growth to 2038 with the minor improvements associated with the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements'), **is considerably worse than current levels (2022 Base)**.

Journey times for both Downton Road and Coombe Road to Exeter Street Roundabout are 43-45% longer. The queue and delay analysis picture are equally bad, with the four roads that feed the Harnham Gyratory all worsening in the 2038 DS2 scenarios compared with the 2022 Base. At both AM and PM time, queues for Downton Road, Coombe Rod and New Harnham Road are **twice to three times worse**. AM and PM delays are predicted to worsen considerably for these roads. The analysis also shows that the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' scheme **actually exacerbates, rather than improves** AM peak queues for Downton and Coombe Road. This analysis clearly confirms that the Harnham Gyratory is unable to cope with the increased level of traffic associated with Local Plan growth to 2038 and will exceed the 85% vehicle capacity all scenarios.

<sup>[1]</sup> Strategic Outline Business Case.

<sup>[2]</sup> Western Gateway Sub-National Transport Body (STB) letter to the Department of Transport dated March 2022.

<sup>[3]</sup> <https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/4007/Salisbury-junction-improvements>.

<sup>[4]</sup> <https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/documents/s148763/WHSAP08ASalisburyTransportStrategySummaryJune2018.pdf>

<sup>[5]</sup> <https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/documents/s148760/WHSAP08SalisburyTransportStrategyDraftStrategyRefreshJuly2018.pdf>

<sup>[6]</sup> Where DM2b (Do Minimum) includes projected Local Plan growth to 2023 which is excluded from the 'Core' scenario.

<sup>[7]</sup> HEAT – Health, Education and Technology.

## Questions (24-84Q)

1. Why did Wiltshire Council include details and costs for the £17.495m 'A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements' programme in the September 2023 IDP – a Local Plan supporting document - when this programme was cancelled and replaced by a smaller scheme in March 2022?

### Response

Detailed design of the reduced scheme remains ongoing and accurate analysis of delivery costs will be undertaken through Early Contractor Involvement. At the time of writing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Major Road Network scheme was the more evolved, with delivery costs considered more accurate than early attempts to cost the smaller scheme and accuracy was considered more important given scrutiny of costs of infrastructure delivery against viability.

2. Is the 'A36 Southampton Road Upgrades' fully funded, how much is expected from National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) funding versus developer contributions, and when is the work expected to commence?

### Response

The A36 Southampton Road forms part of the Strategic Road Network and is the full responsibility of National Highways. Funding for the upgrades is not included in the current Road Investment Strategy (RIS2). It is expected the next iteration of the Road Investment Strategy (RIS3) will include funding; however, a date for publication of RIS3 has not yet been confirmed.

3. How much of the £2.5m funding has been secured for the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements, what is the developer/CIL contributions, have the deliverability issues (infrastructure under the lights and disruption during works) been resolved, and when will the work commence?

### **Response**

Wiltshire Council's Infrastructure Funding Statement, published in December 2023, commits £1,377,783 of CIL contributions towards the scheme, as approved in February 2022.

Section 106 funds of £1,551,363 were secured against planning application 19/05824/OUT towards the delivery of the Salisbury Transport Strategy, with recognition that enhancement to Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabout would directly serve the traffic impact from the development.

The Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabout scheme is progressing through detailed design, and subject to updated cost estimates, work is expected to start on site in 2025.

4. Why did both the Local Plan's Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11 (Transport) for Sites 6, 8 & 9 in Harnham and the plans for the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' only appear to reflect Local Plan traffic growth to 2026 and not to 2038?

### **Response**

All Local Plan development proposals have been incorporated into revised junction modelling for a forecast year of 2038, with model outputs and reporting available at [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/local-plan-document-library](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/local-plan-document-library).

5. When will the Salisbury Transport Strategy be updated given that, now 6+ years old, it is clearly out of date and not fit for purpose

### **Response**

The Wiltshire Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft 2020-2038 includes provision for the delivery of contributions towards the Salisbury Transport Strategy. Whilst this is not implicit that a revised strategy is committed to the update will follow from the adoption of either the Local Plan or Local Transport Plan.

6. Will the Council produce a 'plain English' version of the Transport Topic Paper so that the impact of planned traffic growth associated with the Local Plan to 2038 can be understood by residents, and for the Council to be crystal clear on the impact of

increased traffic in 2038 and whether the mitigations planned will reduce vehicle capacity to acceptable levels (i.e., <85%)?

### **Response**

The Transport Topic Paper provides a summary of detailed reports held at [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/local-plan-document-library](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/local-plan-document-library).

The Topic Paper provides a summary of strategic modelling in Salisbury on page 19 and concludes that congestion will exist following the intervention of the Local Plan, It should be noted this congestion precedes the Local Plan; i.e. not produced as a direct result of the plan. Further and more detailed modelling of the A338 Salisbury Junctions scheme is provided on pages 23, 24 and 25 and concludes that works to the junctions are necessary for the mitigation of the Local Plan and despite this, additional delays of 39 seconds will occur for New Harnham Road and an additional 25 seconds will occur for Coombe Road and thus wider measures within the Transport Strategy will need to be brought forward to support the scheme.

The more detailed reports held on the website provide a series of metrics for the Salisbury Junctions scheme and strategic modelling. For the junctions scheme, microsimulation modelling has been utilised for the assessment of a network of multiple junctions and isolating a volume to capacity for an entire network is not precise and not used. The operation of the network is however compared against a baseline and a do-minimum forecast traffic scenarios, with the operation presented as a function of journey time, average speed and delay.

7. What “sizeable contributions” against the Netherhampton Road Development (ref Transport Topic Paper Par 7.31) have been secured?

### **Response**

Section 106 funds of £1,551,363 were secured against planning application 19/05824/OUT.

8. Has the Council confirmed with the South Western Ambulance Service that “sirens and lights” (Ref Para 7.4 of the Transport Topic Paper) will be sufficient to cope with the increased traffic levels associated with Local Plan growth to 2038? If not, it would be helpful to understand why?

### **Response**

The wider NHS, incorporating local health trusts, have been consulted. Given the extent of consultation, it is possible to identify individuals who belong to Wiltshire Ambulance Service and Great Western Ambulance Service, but it is not possible to confirm that the service has been directly consulted beyond these individuals.

9. Para 4.9 of the Topic Paper makes is clear that “the application of walking, cycling and public transport measures are coded as a reduction in vehicle trips of a length or distribution appropriate for the alternative mode.” What assumptions have been made for the use of alternative transport means for residents of Sites 6, 8 & 9 (Policy



26, Policy 27 & Policy 28) and are these realistic given the topography of Harnham (Sites 8 & 9)?

**Response**

Site specific assumptions for walking and cycling were not a function of the countywide strategic traffic model. Each site was assessed through the sustainability process which is summarised on pages 3 and 4 of the Transport Topic Paper and reproduced in full against objective 11 in Sustainability Appraisal Annex 2.11 - Salisbury HMA: Salisbury Sites Assessment. Topography and constraints presented by gradients was considered for each site.

10. Given the findings in the Transport Topic paper and Appendices, does the Council agree that the increase in traffic in Harnham associated with the Local Plan growth to 2038 cannot fully be mitigated by the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' programme or any other planned programme, and that V/C rates will exceed 85% at all key junctions? (A straightforward "yes" or "no" answer with supporting comment would be appreciated). If, "yes", then is it correct to conclude that there is insufficient transport infrastructure in Harnham to support the planned developments set out in Policy 26, Policy 27 & Policy 28 of the draft Local Plan?

**Response**

Yes. In answering the question, the year 2038 is considered to include Core Strategy development impact, Local Plan impact and wider strategic growth; specific attribution to Local Plan growth cannot be isolated from other factors. The Transport Topic Paper is clear that delays will increase, even with the implementation of the A338 Junctions scheme and that wider Salisbury Transport Strategy measures will need to be implemented. With regards to insufficient transport infrastructure in Harnham, whilst measures will be sought to maximise local walking, cycling and bus use, wider measures across the entirety of Salisbury will be necessary to reduce the need to travel by car and provide alternative travel mode of choice for longer journeys. Some of the measures are already set out in the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan; others will be determined by the Public Transport Strategy previously presented to Cabinet.

11. Does the Council intend to update the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' webpage to reflect traffic growth to 2038 and to be transparent to residents that the scheme will not adequately mitigate the increase in traffic associate with Local Plan growth to 2038 and that the scheme makes queuing actually worse not better at some peak AM/PM times and for some roads that feed the Gyratory, as at 2038?

**Response**

The 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' webpage reflects the scheme as designed and assessed for its forecast year, 2026. The Local Plan assessment considers the impact of the Local Plan on the proposed scheme beyond its forecast year and at the extent of its design capability.

## **Wiltshire Council**

### **Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

#### **Agenda Item 8 – Mid Year Treasury Management Review 2024/25**

##### **Questions from Catherine Read**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management and Strategic Planning**

---

#### **Statement 1**

In 2019 Wiltshire Council declared a climate emergency. Along with that comes a responsibility and commitment to do everything in its power to minimise the worsening of global heating that leads to climate breakdown. This includes how it uses our public money, which would be expected not to finance oil and gas that has caused and continues to worsen the climate breakdown we are experiencing.

#### **Statement 2**

JP Morgan Chase, Black Rock, HSBC and Barclays have consistently been in the top ten banks that invest in oil and gas. JP Morgan Chase has topped the global list of fossil fuel bankers, funnelling a staggering £347 billion into the industry. Barclays sank it sank more than £148.4 billion and HSBC, despite its announcement to no longer finance new oil and gas, the thresholds (which only prevent it from financing SOME coal projects and companies) are not strict enough to meet the Paris Agreement's climate objectives.

#### **Question (24-86Q)**

1. How can you be confident and assure the public that the £20m of public money invested in the National Bank of Kuwait and the Qatar National Bank are not being used to fund oil and gas?

#### **Response**

The council approves a Treasury Management Strategy Statement at the beginning of every financial year that sets out the parameters that are used in decisions on investing the council's money. Part of the treasury management operation is to ensure that cash flow is adequately planned, with cash being available when it is needed. The investment priorities are security first, followed by liquidity second, then yield (return).

Surplus monies are invested in appropriately risk assessed counterparties or instruments commensurate within the council's risk appetite set out in the Strategy, providing adequate liquidity initially before considering investment return.

As the council's approach to investing is primarily about the security of investments the counterparties are significantly limited and investments are placed in sterling. The council does not specify to its counterparties the onwards use of the investments. [The investments with these counterparties are place for specified periods.]

2. Will the council commit to stop putting public money into these banks and if so, when will that happen? If not, why not?

**Response**

The investment priorities of the council are to security first, followed by liquidity second, then yield (return). Surplus monies are invested in appropriately risk assessed counterparties or instruments and these investments are placed on the criteria set out in Treasury Management Strategy Statement only and if banks and investment institutions meet the criteria set out in that Strategy the council is able and may place investments with them.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

**Questions from Dr Gill Anlezark**

**To**

**Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Question (24-82Q)**

There is an urgent need to decarbonise transport and reduce the 40% of Wiltshire's carbon emissions from private car use. It is time for Wiltshire Council members and officers to participate in the effort to do this by providing information on sustainable access to council meeting venues as a matter of course. For example, County Hall Trowbridge is easily accessible by walking or wheeling and train or bus from many parts of the town and county.

In view of the Agenda item 10 Local Transport Plan (LTP) 4, please could the cabinet member for Highways, Street Scene and Flooding explain why the only transport information given to attendees is a link to the location of car parking?

**Response**

The importance of decarbonising transport is recognised and reflected in our Business Plan, Climate Strategy and development of the draft Local Transport Plan for Wiltshire for presentation at Cabinet to undertake public consultation.

Journey planning across Wiltshire can be undertaken via our Connect Wiltshire website: [Getting around | Your Transport Options | Connecting Wiltshire](#)

The Agenda front sheet can be updated to reflect this.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

**Questions from Margaret Willmot**

**To**

**Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Statement**

The underlying theme in LTP4 that Wiltshire is a rural and therefore car-dependent county is at variance with the reality that, while there are sparsely populated areas, most people live in or near towns. This is confirmed within LTP4 itself which indicates that 72% of Wiltshire's population are within 30 minutes by walking or public transport from towns (County-wide sub-strategies p.75).

'Rural areas' as defined by LTP4 includes many areas which have good local services and/or good access to principal settlements or market towns. For example in Salisbury it seems that both Wilton (a Local Service Centre) and Laverstock (a Small Village) are categorised as 'rural' in LTP4. This despite the fact that both are within the geographical area covered by the Salisbury Transport Strategy. The objectives of this strategy include 'reduce the need to travel by car'. However according to LTP4 this means that Wilton is at a higher risk of social exclusion due to lower car ownership (Place-based sub-strategies p.55).

The recurring theme that people need to rely on their cars in rural areas does not apply when 'rural areas' are defined across the county simply by virtue of the Wiltshire Core Strategy definitions. The fact that 8% of households in rural areas don't have access to a car, and 7.1% travel to work by active travel modes shows that other options are possible, and indeed should be encouraged. The current lack of ambition and woolly definition of rurality has resulted in an LTP4 which falls far short of what is required to meet the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan. Areas should be categorised by the availability of access to local amenities, nearby settlements and public transport links.

**Question (24-85Q)**

Will Wiltshire Council be reviewing their definition of rurality so that LTP4 better reflects the accessibility of services rather than relying simply on settlement size?

**Response**

The place-based strategy approach is aligned to the Local Plan and responds directly to the rich diversity of place types in the county, including large rural areas. It is recognised that many people have no choice but to rely on the private car for daily trips whilst many people do not have access to a private car. The draft LTP is

underpinned by the need to provide genuine choice of transport options for all residents. Responses received during the public consultation will be used to inform the final document which will be presented to a future Cabinet and Full Council for adoption.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

**Questions from Catherine Read**

**To**

**Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Statement**

The draft plan has identified a transport emission gap between what Wiltshire needs to achieve to meet its carbon reduction commitments and what the plan will provide for. It is falling short by some 2/3rds. 'Closing the emissions gap is important: it is the total cumulative emissions that drive climate change. Greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere causing warming for decades once released. Each year in which emissions remain above pathway levels adds further to cumulative emissions and make it harder for emissions to be brought back to the levels required to meet climate change commitments'

**Question (24-87Q)**

Do you agree that the emission gap needs to be closed? If so, what other measures (that are not included in the plan at present) will you be investigating that will decarbonise at a higher rate and reduce emissions to keep within the Transport decarbonisation Plan/net zero strategy range?

**Response**

Closing the remainder of the emissions gap is beyond the direct control of the Council, and the influence of LTP4. It is recognised that wider national and regional action is required to address emissions from trips over which LTP4 measures have limited influence, particularly freight trips and trips passing through the county. The Council is working closely with the Sub-National Transport Body, Western Gateway, as well as transport operators in this context. Following public consultation, LTP4 will be presented to Cabinet and Full Council for adoption. Subsequently detailed delivery plans will be developed in accordance with adopted policy and the agreed monitoring and evaluation measures. Interventions will be expected to meet LTP4 objectives, including ensuring accessibility. Measures developed will also need to account carefully for lifecycle carbon impacts (associated embedded carbon).

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

**Question from Colin Gale**

**To**

**Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Statement**

Page 157, Paragraphs 5 & 6: These paragraphs identify the process for announcements at area boards etc. Some area boards are identified in both paragraphs ie Marlborough, Westbury, Trowbridge etc and some area boards are not identified in either paragraph ie Devizes, Pewsey Melksham etc.

**Question (24-88Q)**

Please can you advise if this is simply an error and omission or if some other process is going to be used to advise the areas that are not included?

**Response**

This is an omission. All Area Boards should have been included. This will be corrected before publication.



**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

**Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

**Question from Jimmy Walker**

**To**

**Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Statement**

A total of 29 people were killed in road traffic accidents in 2022 and as of August this year a further 13 people have died. Serious road casualties have decreased in Wales since the introduction of 20mph speed limits and this drop in casualties occurred on both 20mph and 30mph roads in Wales. The roll out speed reductions has been seen to be a cost-effective mechanism to significantly reduce road fatalities and the numbers of residents seriously injured. Wiltshire has introduced the aim of “zero road deaths” associated with the development of the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 4 LTP4.

**Question (24-89Q)**

How is Wiltshire going to achieve net zero road fatalities and are they going to extend the use of speed reductions to alleviate the epidemic of road deaths and seriously injured road users in Wiltshire.

**Response**

Road safety is a priority for Wiltshire Council. With our partners on the Wiltshire and Swindon Road Safety Partnership, the Council is moving to a ‘safe systems’ approach to achieve vision zero.

There are many contributory factors to road traffic collisions and to ensure meaningful and long lasting reductions in Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties we focus on the 3E's principal (Education, Enforcement and Engineering).

Utilising small sample sizes of data sets to attribute changes in recorded casualties is not appropriate and assessing the benefits of policy changes should only be determined from long term analysis. Studies on the implementation of 20mph speed limits have shown the benefits to differ from location to location, and year to year and will be continued to be assessed on a case by case basis.

Standard criteria exists for assessing speed limits in the county as required by national guidance and as recently reported to Environmental Select Committee.

## **Wiltshire Council**

### **Cabinet**

**19 November 2024**

---

### **Agenda Item 10 – Local Transport Plan**

#### **Question from Andrew Nicolson – Wiltshire Climate Alliance**

#### **To Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

##### **Statement 1**

Given that your Climate Strategy committed you to an information campaign to help increase awareness of climate change, and to better understand the area's carbon baseline and forecast and the impact of different transport actions, and that your Delivery Plan's cross-cutting actions include supporting Town and parish councils and Area Board Environment Leads and developing your comms and engagement with residents and organisations:

##### **Question (24-90Q)**

1. Can you provide examples from the past two years of Wiltshire Council public communications raising awareness of the climate impact of transport and traffic across Wiltshire and explaining the urgency of the need to decarbonise transport in line with your climate commitments and the UK's targets? And

##### **Response**

Our #WiltsCanDoThis social media campaign, which has been running since September 2021, covers a whole range of tips and suggestions to reduce residents' carbon footprint, and part of this campaign covers transport. We have promoted car clubs, car share schemes, public transport alternatives and reducing fuel consumption during the life of the campaign, among other suggestions.

We have heavily promoted the Wiltshire Connect bus service in the Pewsey Vale area, with support from Great Western Railway. This service offers many local and social benefits, including reducing carbon emissions and has been shortlisted for a CiTTi (City Transport and Traffic Innovation) Public Transport Award.

The Wiltshire Council Term Maintenance Contract, with Milestone, has also been shortlisted for a national EDIE net-zero award – Supply Chain Decarbonisation Project of the Year. This has been promoted through regular media channels.

Residents can also subscribe to the Council's monthly 'Highways Newsletter' which provides regular updates on our highway and transport interventions and initiatives,

2. If so, can you outline how you have monitored the impact of these communications and used such data to develop these core messages and enhance their impact? Or if not, why not?

## **Response**

The impact of our communications are regularly monitored through our Performance and Outcomes Board process. Data is used to directly tailor future communications campaigns and is an important element of our evidence led approach.

For example, the #WiltsCanDoThis social media campaign as a whole has seen 61 messages posted on Facebook and 62 posted on X (Twitter), covering a range of topics, not just transport. Throughout its lifetime, the campaign has generated 2,626 clicks to information on the Wiltshire Council website and other calls to action, and has been seen by more than 150,000 people.

3. As you are placing the responsibility for engagement with a majority of Community Areas on the shoulders of SEPMs, can you give any other recent examples of significant County-wide consultations on statutory plans where you delegated responsibility to SEPMs, or to Area Board Chairs, or ABELs to a similar degree, and say how well that worked out in terms of numbers of engagement responses, etc., and

## **Response**

LTP4 is accompanied by a comprehensive engagement plan, of which Area Boards form one essential part as detailed in the Cabinet report.

4. How are you engaging with town and parish councils (and voluntary organisations) in this consultation, taking place over the Xmas holiday period as it does, in such a way that it respects their meeting dates and cycles, and enables them to engage with their communities in turn and collectively consider the draft LTP4 documents and develop and submit responses in time to be taken into account?

## **Response**

The consultation will be run over an extended eight week period. As detailed in the report the Council will be hosting two webinars; one before Christmas and one in January. Hard copies of the document will be available in Libraries and direct engagement will be undertaken with Town and Parish Councils, and other local stakeholders to allow sufficient time for responses.