

COUNCIL
22 February 2011

**SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY – REVIEW OF HOUSING AND
EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS**

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR IAN MCLENNAN
LAVERSTOCK, FORD & OLD SARUM DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR JOHN BRADY, CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT, PLANNING AND HOUSING**

Question 1

Page 129 of Council papers

Page 30 Strategic Objective 2

The requirements for South Wiltshire have dropped by 20%. There is a will in Government and amongst rural councillors, to permit some local building to house the young of their community.

Why does the document still insist that “Well over half the number will have been built in or around Salisbury”?

Question 2

The first desired outcome states that the local character will be respected.

Why is the Parish of Laverstock & Ford not included in this desired outcome and why is a previously essential strategic gap separating two communities within the parish and part of a Conservation zone, now not worthy of retention at all?

Question 3

Page 130 of Council Papers

Desired outcomes – Relocation of businesses from Churchfields Estate to more unconstrained locations.

Why has the ideal relocation site for Churchfields – namely Netherhampton Road, been deleted entirely and the remote site of Longhedge – in the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford – been allocated 8 hectares of additional land, when none of the employment land allocated to Old Sarum (Next door), in the current Local Plan, has been used?

Question 4

Why has the 'TOWN/ancient Capital' Wilton been drastically cut from an allocation of 950 to 220, when representatives were calling out for development to save the town?

Question 5

Why are Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Pitton, Whiteparish and the Winterslows depicted as having Downton as a service centre, when there is no natural relationship at all? Why is Laverstock & Ford Parish not mentioned in its own right and described only as "Settlements located in the northern part of the community area"?

Question 6

Page 132 council papers

Page 49 Core Policy 2 Strategic Allocations

There are only four major greenfield sites allocated in the whole of South Wiltshire. How can having two allocated in one rural parish (Laverstock & Ford) be either fair or justifiable?

Question 7

As a result of the proposed allocations Laverstock & Ford Parish – largely rural until the last Local Plan – is targetted for 950 dwellings + 8 hectares of additional Employment land and the removal of most of its green space. This is in addition to the 850 dwellings and several hectares of Employment land, absorbed in the current Local plan. Given that 474 of the dwellings are yet to be built and none of the Employment land has been used, this burden is far to great for a single parish to be allocated. Given the complete unfairness and blatant disregard for local representation, will the cabinet member explain how he is able to support this undoubted rape of a single parish and loss of its entire character?

Question 8

Apart from an orchestrated petitioning by people living, in many cases, miles from the site, what are the reasons that the ideal expansion of Netherhampton Road to accommodate dwellings and Churchfields relocation, has been removed from the Core Strategy?

Question 9

Page 133 Council Papers

Page 145-7 Core Strategy Hampton Park Development

Place Shaping Requirements:

“Defining the Strategic Gap between the development and the settlement of Ford”

How can that statement be meaningful, whilst the numbers remain at 500 and used virtually all the existing Strategic Gap?

Question 10

“A community forum be established to help steer the development for the site and ensure that outcomes meet local needs”

How can the virtual elimination of the existing narrow strip of land separating Ford & Hampton Park (both in the Parish of Laverstock & Ford) permit any local needs? Surely, these needs should have been met by deleting the allocation, as local need and fair play dictate?

Question 11

Given the rejection of 500 additional dwellings at Hampton Park, at the Strategic Planning meeting of 16th February and the comments by councillors from the rest of Wiltshire, that the site was unsuitable for development, owing to the impact on Ford (due to the loss of the strategic gap) and Old Sarum Ancient Monument (development could be seen), can the will of the local people and the unanimous verdict of the councillors be upheld and the whole of the strategic gap be retained as an essential ingredient to the setting of Salisbury and the Parish of Laverstock & Ford?