

Minutes

Extraordinary Meeting of : The Council
Meeting held in : The Auditorium, City Hall, Salisbury
Date : Wednesday 23 April 2008

Present

Councillor Mrs E A Chettleburgh - **Chairman**
Councillor I D McLennan - **Vice-Chairman**

Councillors:

R A Beattie, R Britton, Mrs J V Broom, D W Brown, P M Clegg, R J Clewer, I C Curr, B E Dalton, Mrs S L Dennis, C Devine, E R Draper, P D Edge, Mrs M I Evans, S R Fear, M G Fowler, Mrs J A Green, M A Hewitt, Mrs C R Hill, J Holt, S J Howarth, J P King, Ms J F Launchbury, M D Lee, D J Luther, Mrs H McKeown, C G Mills, I M Mitchell, Ms C J M Morrison, W R Moss, J C Noeken, M J Osment, D O Parker, L Randall, A C Roberts, J C Robertson, B M Rycroft, P W L Sample, J F Smale, Mrs C A Spencer, A A P Thorpe, I R Tomes, Miss M A Tomlinson, C R Vincent, J M Walsh, I C West, F Westmoreland, and G Wright

Apologies were received from Councillors K A Cardy, J A Cole-Morgan, J M English, G E Jeans, J R G Spencer and K C Wren.

Officers:

Manjeet Gill (Chief Executive), Stewart Agland (Head of Democratic Services), James Chamberlain (Democratic Services), John Crawford (Head of Legal and Property Services), , Eric Teagle (Head of Forward Planning and Transportation), David Milton (Team Leader, Forward Planning and Conservation)

111. Declarations of Interest:

Councillor R J Clewer declared a personal interest in Council Agenda Item 4 (Notice of Motion 145 concerning Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options) in that he was a Member of Whiteparish Parish Council, which had recently discussed the Local Development Framework.

Councillor S Fear declared a personal interest in Council Agenda Item 4 (Notice of Motion 145 concerning Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options) in that he was Director of 14-19 Development at Farnborough College of Technology.

Councillor Mrs H McKeown declared a personal interest in Council Agenda Item 4 (Notice of Motion 145 concerning Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options) in that she was a practicing GP in Salisbury.

Councillors J C Noeken and W R Moss declared personal interests in Council Agenda Item 4 (Notice of Motion 145 concerning Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options) in that they were County Councillors present at a recent meeting of Wiltshire County Council at which the Local Development Framework had been discussed.

112. Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman informed Members of the sad news that Pam Joint, a member of staff for the past eight years, had recently passed away. Mrs Joint had performed a number of roles in her time at the Council, but most recently she had worked tirelessly in the area of Concessionary Bus Passes.

The Chairman also informed Members that there were two vacancies for the Local Government Association conference on 14 May. Members were invited to contact Stewart Agland if they were interested in attending.

Councillor Fowler updated Members on Councillor Cole-Morgan health. The Council was pleased to note that Councillor Cole-Morgan was making a continued recovery.

113. Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options

Members received a verbal presentation from Eric Teagle, Head of Forward Planning and Transportation, and David Milton, Team Leader, Forward Planning and Conservation, setting out the background and purpose of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation.

114. Public Questions/Statement Time:

The Reverend David Scrace asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex A** to the minutes).

Naomi King asked questions on behalf of the Downlands and Watermeadows Trust and in a personal capacity regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The questions are attached as **Annex B** to the minutes).

Pam Rouquette asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex C** to the minutes).

Julian Johnson, County Councillor for Downton and Ebbles Valley, made a statement about the Regional Spatial Strategy.

John Potter made a statement regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The statement is attached as **Annex D** to the minutes).

John Harvey asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex E** to the minutes).

John Rosselli asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex F** to the minutes).

Quentin Skinner asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex G** to the minutes).

Hettie Nyman asked a question regarding the "Preferred Options" Core Strategy document. (The question is attached as **Annex H** to the minutes).

Members also considered the written representations, tabled at the meeting, made by Richard Buxton Environmental and Public Law, and Drivers Jonas Chartered Surveyors.

115. Notice of Motion 145: Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options:

The Council considered Notice of Motion 145 proposed by Councillor King and seconded by Councillor Moss (as set out at Annex A to the agenda). During the discussion of this matter the Chairman called an adjournment to facilitate debate. An amendment to the motion was tabled at the meeting by Councillor Sample and seconded by Councillor Fear.

Resolved – that the amended motion be adopted by this Council as follows:

The full Council will now discuss the preferred Options because there is wide public concern at the options offered on their behalf as 'preferred'. The Council notes the concerns that have been expressed during the public consultation in respect of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options document. It acknowledges that the public consultation period is still open and that it would be inappropriate to make any decisions on the content of the document until all the responses have been received and properly considered. The Council also welcomes the high profile and level of public debate that this project is attracting, which it regards as essential to achieving a robust Core Strategy that truly reflects the views of local communities. On the completion of the current consultation period the results to date will be analysed and incorporated into a new consultation document. Therefore an additional round of consultation will take place. In response to local concerns the Council undertakes to:

- Analyse thoroughly the comments received, consider their implications for the future development of the district and incorporate them into the Local Development Framework evidence base;
- Prepare a revised document that incorporates the issues raised by the public and other consultees;
- Carry out a further round of public consultation to ensure that all concerned feel that they have had a proper opportunity to participate and influence the debate.

116. Notice of Motion 146: Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options:

The Council considered the motion proposed by Councillor Britton and seconded by Councillor Hewitt (as set out at Annex A to the agenda), which incorporated changes proposed at the meeting by the Administration.

Resolved – that the amended motion be adopted by this Council as follows:

Rural Regeneration must be made part of this consultation. The Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy should contain a broad range of measures to ensure rural regeneration and the sustainability and well-being of rural communities. Wherever possible rural communities should be permitted to achieve the development of houses, affordable houses, small offices or workshops that individually, they may seek.

117. Notice of Motion 147: Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options:

The Council considered the motion proposed by Councillor Westmoreland and seconded by Councillor Clewer (as set out at Annex A to the agenda) which incorporated changes proposed at the meeting by the Administration.

Resolved – that the amended motion be adopted by this Council as follows:

The further discussion and consultation shall include:

- Arrangements to brief all District councillors, Parish Councillors, members of the public and other stakeholders, so that the implications and impact of the Preferred Options can be understood and an adequate basis for participation in the consultation process is created.
- The administration will work with all groups and non-aligned Members on the Council to define the scope and nature of the consultation arrangements. These arrangements will ensure that District Councillors are able to make an input to the content of the draft Submission document, particularly in respect of their local areas and the draft Submission document will be subject to agreement by Full Council before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

118. Notice of Motion 148: Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options:

The Council considered the motion proposed by Councillor Launchbury and seconded by Councillor Randall (as set out at Annex A to the agenda) which incorporated changes proposed at the meeting by the Administration.

Resolved – that the amended motion be adopted by this Council as follows:

- (1) that a further round of public consultation be held in respect of a revised document
- (2) and the Submission to the Minister, originally planned for June 2008, should be delayed in order that further discussion and consultation can occur. A revision to the LDS will be published and all stakeholders, including the Government Office for the South West, will be informed of the change to the timetable.

119. Extension of Meeting:

In compliance with Council Policy, as the Council could not conclude its business within 3 hours, it resolved to extend the meeting by one and a half hours (during which time the matters recorded under minutes 115 -118 were considered).

*The meeting finished at: 10.15 pm
Members of the public: 268*

-----Original Message-----

From: David Scrace [mailto:d.scrace@btopenworld.com]
Sent: 22 April 2008 12:02
To: DSUMail
Cc: FRANCES HOWARD; Helena McKeown
Subject: Local development framework

I write as Parish Priest (Vicar) of Harnham and local school Foundation Governor at Harnham Junior School.

My concerns are as follows;
Prefered Option 29

I note the significant increase in housing stock. Presently c.3500 dwellings, with 800 proposed behind the Livestock Market and a further 850 between Harnham and the Hospital. bringing a new total of c. 5150 dwellings.

What provision for amenities, transport and infrastructure are part of the plans? The community is very short of shops and school spaces already without a potential 50% increase in its population. What impact upon local roads and the Harnham gyratory are anticipated? Are these manageable?

What obligations will fall upon the developers and the Wiltshire County Council to alleviate problems caused by the developments?

Dear Mr Agland

Emergency Meeting Questions from the Downland and Watermeadows Trust

DOWNLANDS AND WATERMEADOWS TRUST

Why is preservation of the Quality of the Natural Environment not at the top of the Preferred Options 20 Year Visions, when the majority of the people who responded to last summer's consultation put the "Quality of the Natural Environment" at the top of their list?

Salisbury and South Wiltshire has some of the finest Heritage and Environment anywhere in Europe. The Downlands and Watermeadow Trust are asking the District Council tonight to bring these issues into the very heart of the Local Development Framework and actively explore, with stakeholders in these areas, ways in which our magnificent heritage and natural landscapes can be made a fully recognized national treasure for all to enjoy.

The Preferred Options does talk in glowing terms of the Heritage and Natural Environment of Salisbury and South Wiltshire of which we, as residents, are justly proud and work to maintain and enhance, but strangely, these two elements of Heritage and Natural Environment are not dealt with in equal terms despite their clear equal importance to both residents and visitors alike. So why is our special heritage and the quality of our natural environment not one of the 'Golden Threads' which frame the Core Strategy?

Tourism is identified by preferred option 3.H as "a major sector and growing contributor to the economy of South Wiltshire." Yet there is no mention of heritage or natural environment as a significant factor in the tourism industry, how can this oversight have occurred? The protection and enhancement of our natural environment is not nearly so powerful a message when it is hidden within the limited phrase of "Ensuring growth does not undermine the very qualities which make South Wiltshire so special". Yet these special qualities do not even rate mention in the Preferred Options Golden Thread framework. We need to be pro-active to ensure the health of our environment and our heritage.

The health of our beautiful environment and irreplaceable heritage has to be in conflict with the number of houses and industrial estates currently being indiscriminately pushed upon us. As has been said, Salisbury and South Wiltshire has some of the finest Heritage and Environment anywhere in Europe. Will the District Council give a pledge tonight to bring these issues into the very heart of the Local Development Framework?

Will the Council also pledge tonight to ensure that our magnificent heritage and natural landscapes are preserved and maintained as a national treasure for all to enjoy?

Naomi King

Hon Secretary to the Trust

PS One of our Committee Members will be on hand tomorrow to read these questions

Dear Mr Agland

Re Emergency Council Meeting Tomorrow – Public Questions

I would like to put the following questions to the Council during the time allotted for public questions.

Re Consultation Process

Question 1 – 40 ft Rule

The so called “40 ft rule” has been enormously successful in protecting the view of the Cathedral Spire from all directions in the City and from the surrounding rural hinterland and all the approach roads into the City. 81 % of the consultees during the Our Place in the Future consultation last year wanted to retain the 40ft rule. What possible justification can there be therefore, for the Administration of the District Council to seek to disregard the 40 ft rule in Preferred Options. Their suggestion is that our views of the Cathedral will be safely protected by the planners in Trowbridge. I do not think so. The 40 ft rule has served Salisbury well, the population of Salisbury strongly said that they want to keep it. Will the Administration assure the people of Salisbury that the 40 ft rule will be retained and not made flexible?

Question 2 – Risk Assessment

The Local Development Statement identifies (at Appendix B) a number of **RISKS** which need to be assessed and then addressed during the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Process.

I quote

“Every element of our LDS has been the subject of a risk assessment using Salisbury District Council adopted procedure. This is to identify risks at the outset of each project. Risk assessment will also be carried out throughout the lifetime of each project. Exceptions reporting to the Management Board will be used to assess the corporate appetite for the risk and to decide whether to tolerate, treat or terminate.”

“This framework specifically identified many risks:

- Failure to produce distinctive policies, that reflect the characteristics of Salisbury.
- Evidence base incomplete and unsound
- Non-compliance with Sustainability Appraisal
- Failure to engage successfully during consultation
- No consensus agreed over proposed solutions
- Failure to comply with national and regional policy
- Non-compliance with corporate documents
- Political rejection
- Lack of delivery by project managers
- Capacity of team is reduced

My question is:

A Who is on the Management Board?

B What risks have they identified in relation to:

B.1 **Failure to produce distinctive policies, that reflect the characteristics of Salisbury;** and

B.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks”; and

B.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?

- C What risks have they identified in relation to:
C.1 **Evidence base is incomplete and unsound**; and
C.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
C.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- D What risks have they identified in relation to:
D.1 **Non-compliance with Sustainability Appraisal**; and
D.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
D.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- E What risks have they identified in relation to:
E.1 **Failure to engage successfully during consultation**; and
E.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
E.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- F What risks have they identified in relation to:
F.1 **No consensus agreed over proposed solutions**; and
F.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
F.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- G What risks have they identified in relation to:
G.1 **Failure to comply with national and regional policy**; and
G.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
G.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- H What risks have they identified in relation to:
H.1 **Non-compliance with corporate documents**; and
H.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
H.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- J What risks have they identified in relation to:
J.1 **Political rejection**; and
J.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
J.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- K What risks have they identified in relation to:
K.1 **Lack of delivery by project managers**; and
K.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
K.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?
- L What risks have they identified in relation to:
L.1 **Capacity of team is reduced**; and
L.2 “what is the corporate appetite for these risks” and
L.3 what decisions have been made to tolerate, treat or terminate this project risk?

Yours sincerely

Naomi King

Annex C

From: Pam Rouquette [mailto:pamrouquette@hotmail.com]
Sent: 22 April 2008 10:29
To: Stewart Agland
Subject: Questions for Core Strategy meeting 23 April

I would like to ask the following questions with respect to the current consultation on the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options:-

Is it not premature to be considering the District's LDF Core Strategy in view of the fact that the South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) has not yet been approved? The Panel Report on the RSS is currently (Spring 2008) being considered by the Secretary of State at the Department of Communities and Local Government, and it is understood that a period of consultation on the revised RSS will follow. This will provide an opportunity to question the housing allocation for South Wiltshire before a final RSS is approved. Following this the County would then develop the LDF based on the agreed RSS.

It is also questionable as to whether the public should be asked to consider site allocation for development for both housing and employment land when two studies are to be undertaken which would direct development towards the most appropriate sites. These studies are:

"Wiltshire County Council are currently seeking a consultant to construct a traffic model (or models) of traffic conditions within and in the immediate vicinity of Salisbury city. One of the key outcomes of this study will be to produce a micro simulation model of traffic condition which can be used to test various development scenarios. The contract is due to be awarded in March 2008 and is due to be completed late 2008 to early 2009."

Also

"A separate study is being commissioned by Salisbury District Council (SDC) which will undertake to investigate the relative accessibility of various settlements within the district. This will highlight those areas which have the best availability and access to services and could therefore offer a more sustainable location for development. The study will also identify, in broad terms the transport strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the transport in the settlements."

Pam Rouquette

Can we live up to our Spire?

John Potter writes about the future of Salisbury on behalf of a group of Fellows from the RSA (the Royal Society of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce.) who have responded to the District Council's Preferred Options for the future of the City (and its environs.)

In 1220 Elias of Dereham took responsibility for managing the most ambitious building project in mediaeval Europe, the Cathedral Church of St Mary the Virgin in New Sarum. Five years earlier he had been immersed in shaping the other landmark achievement of his time, Magna Carta. The history of our city is rooted in these two momentous events, which between them shaped a society committed to just government, the rule of law and the fierce ambition and talent to express these aspirations in the carved splendour of Purbeck marble and Chilmark stone.

'Whenever I look up at the Cathedral spire', a colleague confided to me, 'I feel we owe it to our extraordinary predecessors to be as passionately committed to excellence in our time as they were in theirs.'

Heritage

Heritage means fashioning our future around the best from our past. Heritage is not gift-wrapping history in a mawkish and often patronising sentiment. Salisbury's glory was forged in the heat of a courageous vision made real by the tenacity and skill of craftsmen, designers and engineers. Salisbury, the eighth richest city in the land, built its wealth on wool and cloth sold across Europe through the nearby port at Southampton.

At its inception Salisbury would have won an International Town Planners Award for coherent design and project management. It might too have won a Trade Union Award for giving the masons a twenty-five percent pay rise. Pennyfarthing Street remains the public celebration of this act of economic justice. But, above all, Salisbury would have won (and still wins) the visionary's award for daring to build in stone a spire that points us beyond ourselves. Before engaging with our catalogue of preferred options, we have first to answer a prior question. Are we prepared to accept the enduring challenge of Elias of Dereham to stretch our talent for design, innovation and craftsmanship to shape and reshape our city in ways that are worthy of those who first created it?

If the answer is a resounding 'YES', three things follow. We need more *dialogue*, richer *options* and adequate *time* to get our act together. These are serious challenges

More Dialogue

We need more dialogue because it is clear that in spite of the best efforts of City planners a large number of us have not been fully aware of the implications of the proposed increase housing in the region and the district. Over the Christmas period Central Government decided to increase the number of houses needed in the District from 9,200 to 12,400. News of this has now ignited a bushfire of controversy across and beyond our area. Our opportunities for adequate consultation have been limited by the fact that the government's time table for responding to local concerns has slipped without a compensating extension to the consultation period. (The time given for public responses to the preferred options was extended by a fortnight, but 14 days is not enough to undertake meaningful consultation.

The responsible Whitehall department is Communities and Local Government, headed by the Minister, Hazel Blears. Ms Blears is currently promoting an energetic campaign to make local councils more accountable to their electorate. It would be ironic - not to say unacceptable - for the Department responsible for promoting democratic participation to deny Salisbury citizens the urgent opportunity to engage further in the very discussions calculated to 'unlock the talent of local communities'.

So far the consultation has been conducted in the old-style. Members of the Council staff work assiduously to produce a colourful brochure of pictures, statistics, maps and options. This brochure is then politely presented to us at public meetings. A few comments are made, some courteous, others less so. In some cases young planning officers are unfairly subjected to abuse. Little is satisfactorily resolved because the approach is flawed from the outset. Parish Councils need to be engaged from the start, given a full account of the rationale behind the housing targets and invited to share in discussing those targets and the ways in which they might most effectively be responded to. Villages often need to be a little bit bigger in order to enjoy viable facilities. Many people, including first-time buyers, are looking for affordable homes in Salisbury rather face a life-time of commuting with its vengeful wake of carbon emissions. We need new styles of consultation based on tried and tested principles of community development. It is no longer acceptable for authorities to play real life monopoly with houses on a map.

Richer Options

The preferred options offered us are, for the most part based on old technologies. This means houses like the ones we have our new estates; transport design inherited from the fifties and workplace developments such as those at Churchfields, Southampton Road and increasingly the Netherhampton Road. More imagination and genuine choice is needed. We need to consider the latest in environmentally sustainable homes. We need flexible housing where families can grow and shrink as the generations pass. We need a variety of transport to take us round the city centre and to out-of-town car parks. We must find ways to enable parents, children and shopping to reach their cars without parking in the centre. Our city should no longer be blighted by cars that are driven through its streets for only a few minutes a day. We need design offices, galleries and a concert hall worthy of what we can achieve in the arts, crafts and sciences.

Above all we need to retain our best talent in the City area, rather than meekly accept that our most ambitious young people will always leave for more challenging opportunities elsewhere. And of course we need actively to encourage others with ambition and talent to come to Salisbury to enrich our communities. If we are to achieve this aim, we urgently need higher education in the city and along with post-graduate research and development. Particularly, we would suggest, we deserve world-class research and development facilities linked with design, technology, agriculture, planning and the arts.

Salisbury and South Wiltshire should be designated a World Heritage site in recognitions to the architectural and archaeological treasures of the area. We and our visitors can then be helped to understand, appreciate and learn from the achievements of our predecessors in this wonderful place.

More Time

For all this we most urgently need more time to think, gather information and consult with one another. We need to spread the dialogue – as the RSA has attempted to do – from the civic debating chambers to the wider society. We need to value our elected members and officers more and see ourselves as robust partners in a great endeavour, rather than whingeing NIMBYs. We need to engage with commerce, the voluntary sector and with those many organisations committed to caring for our environment and its future. We need to build on the cultural life that our International Festival has generated. The arts and leisure pursuits have a vital part to play alongside the commercial interests of our shops, hotels and workshops. If TESCOs really understood our Vision, they would be ashamed to suggest a warehouse near Stonehenge. We need to extend our conversations to include the military, the farming community, and our young people. This could be the biggest and most creative school project of our generation.

But, for this to happen, we need to extend our initial consultation until the end of summer, so that formal representations to government and forward commitments from the forthcoming Unitary Authority can be in place before March 2009.

The question is: Are we up for it?

From: John Harvey [mailto:john.harvey2@homecall.co.uk]

Sent: 22 April 2008 13:05

To: James Chamberlain

Subject: Meeting at City Hall Wednesday 23 April.

Question:- Why does the Core Strategy document not even mention the infrastructure requirements for the projected 12,400 houses ie roads, water supply, sewerage disposal and flood problems due to increased run-off?

John Harvey, Gomeldon.

From: Mr. J. Rosselli

Address: Coopers Farm, Winterslow

Questions for the Salisbury District Council

1. Having recognised that the natural environment is people's most valued characteristic, and having given priority to protect the identity of villages and not swamp them with new development, how does the council justify the proposal to develop a part of Winterslow that is now fertile agricultural land with a new town of some 6,000 people?
2. The requirement to identify sites for the construction of 12,400 homes in this area is unreasonably high. Has the Council appealed for a lower figure and, if not, will it do so promptly?
3. Given that Salisbury and Wilton will together absorb about 7,400 homes, why is the balance of about 5,000 not shared more or less equally between the remaining areas of Amesbury, Downton, Mere and Tisbury?

CASTLE GROUND FARM
LOWER ZEALS
WARMINSTER
WILTS
BA12 6LF
(01747) 861 496

The Chairman
Salisbury District Council
Salisbury
Wilts

21st April 2008

Dear Sir

I write in relation to the Salisbury District Council's Core Strategy Preferred Options document. Without a shadow of a doubt, proper public consultation has not taken place about these huge proposals. Indeed, at a meeting in Mere on Saturday, attended by around **400** local people, there was a unanimous vote – rather than a 55% / 45% split – and I repeat, a unanimous vote to say that a proper consultation has not taken place at all

I therefore expect that the meeting this week of Salisbury District Council should without a doubt vote for a significant extra extension of the consultation period – the hugely representative sample of the Mere and Western area who attended on Saturday were firmly of the belief that 6 months, rather than a further 6 weeks, was needed to address plans that would change the whole character of the locally beyond belief.

I enclose a DVD of the full coverage of the meeting for your information, which I think that all of your council should see, and I would like to register now that I wish to speak in the public session before your meeting.

Yours faithfully,

Quentin Skinner

Annex H

Hettie Nyman asked whether the Council was aware of plans to extend Porton Down, and whether proposed houses in Winterslow would be for existing Salisbury residents or for new employees at Porton Down.