

# AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting: Cabinet

Place: Kennet Room - County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN

Date: Tuesday 10 December 2024

Time: 10.00 am

---

**The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 2 December 2024. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.**

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Stuart Figini of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718221 or email [committee@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:committee@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

---

5 **Public Participation and Questions from Members** *(Pages 3 - 34)*

All questions and responses document.

6 **Devolution Update**

Questions and responses document – see document at item 5 above.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 9 December 2024
--------------------------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**10 December 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 (24-91Q)**

Local Plan

Can the Council explain why the emerging local plan has not been updated to reflect the status of properties adjacent to the proposed sites, particularly following searches conducted after the completion of the Regulation 18 consultation, which identified Sites 8 and 9 in Salisbury as "reserve sites"?

Additionally, if planning permission is granted for the development of Sites 8 and 9 in Salisbury, does the Council acknowledge any potential liability to homebuyers who purchased properties without full disclosure of this information in their Local Search results?

**Response**

Solicitors acting on behalf of purchasers will specify the extent of the Local Land Charges search that they require, for example the property or land in question, and any adjacent land within the outline on the plan supplied by the solicitor.

Local Land Charge search responses make it clear that searches are completed in accordance with the plan supplied, and will not automatically include adjacent land, unless it is included within the search extent.

If the prospective purchaser wishes to enquire about the status of land in the Local Plan, they can ask this specific question via their solicitor, and this will be revealed through the search process.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**10 December 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; and Cllr Tamara Reay – Cabinet Member for Transport and Assets**

---

**Question (24-92Q)**

Car Parking

The draft county-wide Local Transport Plan 4 sub-strategy for parking doesn't set out a strategy for parking in Salisbury. Does the Council intend to produce a car parking strategy for Salisbury?

The Local Plan has 'deleted' previously identified brownfield land on two car park sites in Salisbury (Salt Lane and Brown Street) because "the pace of redevelopment could not be easily predicted". It would also appear to be dependent on "the implementation of a park and ride facility"? [Table A.8 refers].

Please could you explain these statements, especially why redevelopment cannot be predicted over a 15-year Local Plan period, and whether this deletion is dependent on a car parking strategy for Salisbury that appears missing?

**Response**

The draft LTP4 for Wiltshire is currently subject to public consultation. Measure SU3.8, details of which can be found in the draft Parking Sub-Strategy, states that the council will develop a parking operation and delivery plan.

This plan will include, and detail, arrangements for Salisbury.

**Agenda Item 6 – Devolution**

**Question from Cllr Ian Thorn**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council**

---

**Question (24-93 Q)**

Given the strategic significance of any decision to create a combined authority with Somerset and Dorset. Why should it not be considered by full council?

**Response**

The Deputy Prime Minister wrote to Leaders of councils in July 2024, inviting expressions of interest in devolution setting out preferred governance and geographies by the end of September, in line with high level criteria from the government. Discussions took place with leaders of neighbouring councils to establish the options that were open to us.

A revised expression of interest was submitted by the leaders of Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire Councils on 25 November following statements from Ministers and further informal discussion between leaders.

This, in itself, is not a formal decision to create a combined authority.

The Government are expected to issue their Devolution White Paper ahead of Christmas, which will clarify whether there are intended to be any changes to the legal requirements for the establishment of combined authorities (mayoral or non-mayoral).

Under existing legislation, Councils wishing to establish a Combined Authority must carry out a governance review and publish a scheme recommending creation of the combined authority. There then follows a period of public consultation before any final scheme is implemented.

Whilst there was not a Full Council meeting in September in which to consider the submission of an expression of interest, the support of Full Council will be sought should our proposals progress further with government. This will include being invited to support any public consultation on a governance review and, following that consultation, any final proposal to establish a mayoral combined authority.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**10 December 2024**

---

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

**Question from Cllr Ian Thorn**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council**

---

**Question (24-94 Q)**

What is Wiltshire Council's appetite for auctioning off leases for commercial properties that have been empty for long periods?

**Response**

The Government have recently announced the implementation of High Street Rental Auctions to support businesses and communities seeking to use vacant spaces in their high streets. The Government has announced four early adopter authorities: Darlington BC, Bassetlaw DC and Mansfield DC will trial the auctions, while Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council will act as a critical friend. Wiltshire Council is engaged with the process to learn from this early adoption and to understand how this might work in our area.

Wiltshire Council is currently supporting businesses to take up vacant spaces through the Wiltshire Towns Programme, including supporting 61 new businesses through the Vibrant Wiltshire programme.

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

**Questions from Tim Guy**

**To**

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

---

**Question (24-95Q)**

Local Transport Plan 4

1. Given the importance of **Objective 4: “Futureproofing Transport: Ensuring that Wiltshire has a resilient transport network”** in the Local Transport Plan 4, why does the Sub-Strategy for Salisbury fail to address the City’s significant and persistent transport and traffic issues, which frequently result in gridlock?

**Response**

The Principal settlements Placed-based sub-strategy in Measure I2.2 (page 28) states that the Council will look to ‘engage with and prepare for the rollout of new transport technologies’. In addition, Measure I2.6 ‘Targeted road infrastructure or junction improvements to relieve congestion’ sets out further details on where there is a critical need for targeted road infrastructure or design improvements, which would include congestion hotspots on the strategic road network around Salisbury.

**Question**

2. Why are key issues associated with the **Harnham Gyratory, New Bridge Road, Exeter Street Roundabout**, and the **A36** not reflected in the Sub-strategy?

**Response**

The Local Plan Transport Evidence Base considers the delivery of committed infrastructure works at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabouts and includes policy provision for ongoing commitment to securing developer contributions towards the Salisbury Transport Strategy, which also includes National Highways proposals for the A36. The draft Local Transport Plan 4, which is currently subject to public consultation, sets the strategic framework, with enhanced consideration of detailed works developed through addressing the various measures including SU3.9, which encompasses a refresh [of] our transport policies and plans, such as the Salisbury Transport Strategy.

### Question

3. Why does the Sub-Strategy neglect to acknowledge the **projected worsening of traffic conditions linked to Local Plan housing growth** or propose any measures to address these challenges?

### Response

Please see response to Q2.

### Question

4. Why does the Strategy appear to omit reference to the **'Salisbury Junction Improvements' project**, which is directly relevant and will help mitigate the traffic issues, if only to a limited degree?

### Response

Please see response to Q2.

### Question

5. Does the Council agree that these significant omissions undermine the integrity and objectives of the Local Transport Plan 4 – i.e. there appears to be no 'Plan' for Salisbury - and that they should be addressed urgently as part of the response to the ongoing consultation?

### Response

The draft LTP4, which is currently subject to public consultation, provides the strategic framework for Wiltshire over the coming years. Further detailed work such as in the locations mentioned, will come forward separately through specific studies. This will include updates to existing Transport Strategies for principal settlements such as Salisbury. We welcome comments on this approach and encourage people to respond during the consultation period, which ends on 24<sup>th</sup> January, with their views.



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

**Questions from Sally Ross**

**To**

**Cllr Dominic Muns – Cabinet Member for Waste and Environment**

---

**Question (24-96Q)**

Air Quality

1. Has the Council undertaken an Air Quality assessment of the roads feeding onto the Harnham Gyratory to understand the future air quality impact associated with the increasing levels of traffic due to Local Plan housing growth?

**Response**

The councils air quality monitoring network has evolved over the years as experience and knowledge has been gained.

The council monitors in locations where this experience has shown air quality is most likely to exceed UK Air Quality Objectives. Downton Road and other roads around the gyratory have been monitored historically and never found to be a problem at relevant receptors (the facade of domestic property). Within Wiltshire air quality has been found to be an issue where properties open directly onto a heavily trafficked road that has canyon-like characteristics. Pollutant levels can be further exacerbated where there is a hill so placing vehicle engines under greater load.

Properties close to the gyratory are set back from the roadside and the locality enjoys good dispersal characteristics. We also know that pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide fall off rapidly from roadside.

It is also important to note that the relationship between congestion and pollution is currently a divergent one, as the composition of the national vehicle fleet makes the transition to electric and lower emissions vehicles.

Overall air quality in Wiltshire has improved significantly and this is reflected in the monitoring results for all 8 AQMAs, some of which can move to be revoked in the next few years.

**Question**

2. Is the Council concerned about the impact on Air Quality for this junction and the feeder roads, especially given the proximity of schools?

**Response**

No, for the reasons given above. We are currently planning an air quality sensor project which will focus on PM2.5. The draft project plan proposes to involve schools in the project and will be looking for schools interested in participating.

### **Question**

3. Does the Council intend to propose that the Air Quality Management Area for Salisbury extends to the Harnham Gyrotory and feeder roads? It currently only extends to Exeter Street Roundabout.

### **Response**

No. Air quality has improved across the city and we are at the point we will begin to consider when to revoke the 3 AQMAs. Currently DEFRA require 3 years data 10% below the objective or 5 years data below the object as a whole before revocation can be considered.

There is no mechanism at present to declare an AQMA for PM2.5 as this is a national objective incumbent on Government to achieve.

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

**Questions from Celia Beckett**

**To**

**Cllr Nick Holder – Cabinet Member for Highways, Street Scene and Flooding**

---

**Question (24-97Q)**

Flooding

I would like to ask some questions about the flooding as a result of Storm Bert and how Wiltshire is considering future proofing to mitigate flood events. The flooding was particularly severe in the Bristol Avon Vale: Malmesbury; Chippenham; Lacock; Melksham; Staverton; and Bradford on Avon.

We have spent 3 1/2 years exploring the risk factors locally in connection with the Local Plan. Flooding with the associated traffic implications is a major concern for local residents. Staverton bridge was closed for 3 1/2 days from the 24 Nov with the river at a record high and the situation in Bradford on Avon was extremely serious. I am sure you will be aware of the consequent traffic chaos.

We are also aware that the DoE is in the process of updating the flood maps.

1. What are the likely implications for flooding of extensive development throughout the Avon Vale area with site allocations in the local plan and the reserve sites? This could see 1000s of additional houses built in areas that have historically been marshland, slowing the runoff into the river from the drainage ditches. Shouldn't there be further plans for water sequestration: to increase the areas for water retention: allowing the water to safely infiltrate the soil with appropriate planting of trees and schemes to slow the release of the water?

**Response**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) mandates that all developments incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). These systems, which include measures such as allocating areas for water retention, planting trees, and creating schemes to slow the release of water, offer significant benefits. By managing water close to its source, these approaches help reduce flood risk, enhance water quality, and promote overall environmental sustainability.

It is essential that development does not increase flood risk, either to the site itself or to neighbouring land. Local planning authorities must ensure the integration of these water management strategies into their development plans to support sustainable and resilient growth. In this regard, Wiltshire Council has introduced its Surface

Water Betterment Strategy, which requires a 30% improvement in runoff rates compared to existing conditions. This strategy equips developers with a comprehensive toolkit to create well-informed drainage strategies that align with both national and local policies. Furthermore, the strategy is now incorporated into the emerging Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) at Levels 1 and 2, ensuring that flood risk is consistently addressed in development planning.

### **Question**

2. Does the council agree that recent events, the third serious episode of flooding this year indicate that we have reached a critical stage where action to try to reduce future flooding is imperative to protect existing communities.

### **Response**

Flooding and the impact of climate change are not new issues; they have been recognised for years, with Sir Michael Pitt's 2007 review highlighting the need for action. The legislation that followed, including the Flood and Water Management Act, sought to improve resilience, but unfortunately Schedule 3, which would have provided much-needed regulation on surface water management, has not been implemented in England.

Building flood defences alone will never be sufficient, as climate change continues to increase the frequency and severity of extreme weather events. Therefore, it is essential that we move beyond traditional flood defence infrastructure and start implementing more strategic measures. These include property-level protection, flood resilience and resistance measures, and the development of policies that, in certain areas, forbid development in flood-prone zones altogether. The latter should be a mandatory policy enforced by central government to prevent further exposure to flood risks.

This comprehensive, multi-faceted approach requires stronger legislative direction, along with greater government support and funding to address the root causes of flooding. Only through such a coordinated and well-resourced approach can we begin to reduce the risks of future flooding, safeguard our communities, and adapt to the evolving challenges posed by climate change. It is imperative that the government urgently prioritises this issue, ensuring that the necessary measures and resources are put in place for the long-term protection of our areas at risk.

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

**Questions from Peter Chase**

To

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

---

**Question (24-98Q)**

Local Plan

Please can you provide a table showing the number of brownfield sites that are allocated in the Local Plan compared with greenfield sites, for each of the three Housing Market Areas and for the Salisbury Principal settlement?

**Response**

The following table has been prepared based on the emerging Local Plan, rather than the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Further information about the policies listed below can be found in the emerging Local Plan, which can be viewed via this [link](#)

Housing Market Area	Policy Number	Site Name	Greenfield	Brownfield
Chippenham	Policy 7	Land south of Chippenham and East of Showell Farm, Chippenham	✓	
	Policy 8	Bath Road Car Park and Bridge Centre, Chippenham		✓
		Emery Gate Shopping Centre, Chippenham		✓
		Chippenham railway station and Cocklebury Road area, Chippenham		✓
	Policy 10	Land off Spitfire Road, Calne	✓	
	Policy 11	Land to the North of Spitfire Road, Calne	✓	
	Policy 12/Policy 3	Land east of Leafield Trading Estate, Corsham (Local Plan Review Reserve Site)		✓
	Policy 13	Land south of Dicketts Road, Corsham	✓	
	Policy 15	Land at Devizes Wharf, Assize Court and Wadworth Brewery, Devizes		✓
	Policy 16/Policy 3	Land off Park Lane and Sherston Close, Malmesbury (Local Plan Review Reserve Site)	✓	

	Policy 18	Land east of Melksham, Melksham	✓	
	Policy 19	Land off Bath Road, Melksham	✓	
	Policy 20	Land north of the A3102, Melksham	✓	
Salisbury	Policy 23	Land north east of Old Sarum, Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 24	Land at Netherhampton Garden Centre, Salisbury		✓
	Policy 25	Land north of the Beehive Park and Ride, Old Sarum, Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 26	Land north of Downton Road, Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 27	Land south of Harnham, Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 28	Land west of Coombe Road, Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 29	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), South Salisbury	✓	
	Policy 30	Land east of Church Road, Laverstock	✓	
	Policy 33	The Maltings and Central Car Park		✓
	Policy 34	Churchfields Principal Employment Area		✓
	Policy 35	Salisbury District Hospital Campus, Salisbury	✓	✓
	Policy 40	Land south east of Empress Way, Ludgershall	✓	
	Policy 41	Land at Bulridge Estate, Wilton	✓	
Policy 42	Land at Dead Maid Quarry Employment Area, Mere	✓		
Swindon	Policy 45	Land at Chopping Knife Lane, Marlborough	✓	
	Policy 46	Land off Barton Dene, Marlborough	✓	
	Policy 48	Land at Marsh Farm, Royall Wootton Bassett	✓	
	Policy 49	Land at Midge Hall Farm, Royal Wootton Bassett	✓	
	Policy 50	Land west of Maple Drive, Royal Wootton Bassett	✓	
	Policy 51	Land at Woodshaw, Royal Wootton Bassett	✓	
	Policy 53	Land north east of Hilperton, Trowbridge	✓	
	Policy 54	North Trowbridge Country Park, Trowbridge (SANG)	✓	
	Policy 55	Land at Innox Mills, Trowbridge		✓
	Policy 56	Court Street, Trowbridge		✓

Trowbridge		Castle Street, Trowbridge		✓
		Town Bridge/ Wicker Hill, Trowbridge		✓
		Asda and the Shires, Trowbridge		✓
		Castle Place and car park, Trowbridge		✓
		Riverway Industrial Estate, Trowbridge		✓
		East Wing, Trowbridge		✓
	Policy 57/ Policy 3	Land at Former Golf Course	✓	✓
	Policy 59	Land at Brook Street, Warminster	✓	
	Policy 61	Land west of Mane Way, Westbury	✓	
	Policy 62	Land at Bratton Road, Westbury	✓	
	Policy 63	Westbury Country Park (SANG)	✓	

**Agenda Item 6 – Devolution**

**Question from Cllr Ernie Clark**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council**

---

**Question (24-99 Q)**

We are told that ‘Dorset, Somerset, and Wiltshire Councils have revised their Expression of Interest in devolution, committing to a Mayoral Combined Authority for the Heart of Wessex region’.

When did ‘Wiltshire Council’ make this decision and who actually made it?

I don’t recall this matter ever being discussed at a meeting of the Full Council. Why were Members not consulted?”

**Response**

The Deputy Prime Minister wrote to Leaders of councils in July 2024, inviting expressions of interest in devolution setting out preferred governance and geographies by the end of September, in line with high level criteria from the government. Discussions took place with leaders of neighbouring councils to establish the options that were open to us.

A revised expression of interest was submitted by the leaders of Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire Councils on 25 November following statements from Ministers and further informal discussion between leaders.

This, in itself, is not a formal decision to create a combined authority.

The Government are expected to issue their Devolution White Paper ahead of Christmas, which will clarify whether there are intended to be any changes to the legal requirements for the establishment of combined authorities (mayoral or non - mayoral).

Under existing legislation, Councils wishing to establish a Combined Authority must carry out a governance review and publish a scheme recommending creation of the combined authority. There then follows a period of public consultation before any final scheme is implemented.

Whilst there was not a meeting of Full Council in September in which to consider the submission of an expression of interest, the support of Full Council will be sought



should our proposals progress further with government. This will include being invited to support any public consultation on a governance review and, following that consultation, any final proposal to establish a mayoral combined authority.

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

**Questions from Annabel Lawson**

**To**

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

---

Statement 1

I refer to the **Wiltshire Local Plan**, and specifically to **Policy 26, Site 6, Land north of Downton Road**.

I have interrelated questions, a couple of which point out rather important factual inaccuracies in your data and therefore incorrect assessments reliant on them.

**SA 9 (provide good quality, affordable housing for all)**

You write that “affordable housing has struggled to achieve target rates of 40%”.

Site 6 lies on a gentle slope overlooking particularly beautiful surroundings to the North (the SSI and SAC of the Salisbury water meadows) and to the East (the Conservation village of Britford and a grade two farmhouse and paddocks). The houses of Britford carry £1m+ price tags and those of East Harnham, adjoining the site to the West, are mostly around the £500k mark.

This will be a very, very desirable housing location, and housing here will fetch a lot of money. Far more, for instance, than any other comparable site in Salisbury recently built upon, with the possible exception of the nearby Souchez gardens development where houses reached nearly £1m even a few years ago.

Affordable housing could only be achieved here if a very small percentage of ‘shared ownership’ were on offer for each property, as the overall price would be high, even for flats. A far better solution would be offered by providing some as social housing owned by the Council but that does not seem to be mentioned. Realistically, hospital staff are unlikely to be able to afford housing in this location – immediately between a heritage village and affluent suburb, and that is the most obvious employment in the proximity.

**Question (24-100Q)**

1. When you speak of affordable housing on a site of this nature, what do you mean?

## Response

The definition of affordable housing can be found in Annex 2 of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#).

## Question

2. Obviously, we need to ensure properties remain affordable, relatively, in future years, otherwise the exercise is pointless. How will you do this?

## Response

This is clarified in Policy 76 (Providing affordable homes) of the emerging Local Plan “*all affordable housing will be subject to an appropriate legal agreement with the council*”.

## Question

3. Do you believe that 40% is achievable given this location?

## Response

The emerging Local Plan has been informed by evidence that justifies the 40% affordable policy requirement in line with the provisions of Policy 76.

Current planning policy for Salisbury already requires the delivery of 40% affordable housing, this is clarified in paragraph 6.44 and Core Policy 43 (Providing affordable homes) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

## Statement 2

### **SA 12 - Vibrant and diversified economy and long-term sustainable growth**

The distances on which the overall viability of the site has been assessed are incorrect. In one instance, underestimated by a factor of FIVE.

12.1 The distance to the railway station is cited here as being 2.4km. In the previous SA 11, it is referred to as being 3.5 km. In fact, google maps makes it about 3.3km. This is a critical difference, as some might walk 2.4km considerably more readily, at 3.3, most people would jump in the car.

12.2 you state that “The River Avon, Southampton Road retail park and Principal Employment area and Bourne retail park are approximately 0.7km to the north” and indeed they are. If you can fly.

However, if you wish to get there, you have in fact to walk along the Newbridge Road and Southampton Road which is 3.4km (to Tesco's, for example), as there is no passage through the water meadows. This means that the assessment of the ready proximity of retail employment is nearly FIVE times further than suggested.

I am surprised this has not been picked up at an earlier stage as it surely impacts considerably on the idea that people might walk there – there is no bus route either, you have to go in the car.

**Question (24-101Q)**

4. Does this error undermine the credibility of the Sustainability Appraisal for Site 6?

**Response**

The Sustainability Appraisal considers a range of factors based on local context and evidence. In doing so, it aims to provide a balanced judgement as to whether proposals for development are broadly sustainable and capable of delivering mitigation to address potential issues. The draft Local Plan and all evidence prepared to date will be independently examined by an appointed Inspector in accord with the tests of soundness and legal compliance set out in national planning policy. It follows that the points you raise in respect of the draft Local Plan will be considered in full by the Inspector and there will be opportunity to debate such matters through the examination in public if the Inspector deems this to be necessary in order to conclude whether the proposals within the draft Plan are sound and legally compliant.

**Question**

5. Are there other errors in the Sustainability Appraisal for Site 6 or other sites in Salisbury?

**Response**

See above response.

**Wiltshire Council**

**Cabinet**

**10 December 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**

---

Statement

In response to my Cabinet question for the 19 November 2024 meeting which sought 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), the Council responded as follows:

*“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.”*

However, unlike other Statements of Common Ground, the one between Wyatt Homes and Wiltshire Council has not been made available on the Council’s website: <https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/local-plan-document-library>

**Question (24-102Q)**

Please can Cabinet explain why this is so, on what grounds this has been withheld, and when this will be available for public scrutiny?

**Response**

The Statements of Common Ground (SOCG) that have been completed and made available relate to those with prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities. Those that are under preparation with site promoters will be published when they are ready, which is now likely to be in January 2025.

**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**

---

Statement 1

I am trying to understand how the 350 number for small windfall sites of less than 10 dwellings and the neighbourhood area designation requirement of 60 for Salisbury principal settlement is calculated (Local Plan Policy 22). Also, is this over a 15 year or 18-year period?

I have tried to understand the calculation from the Planning for Salisbury, Revised Spatial Strategy, Housing Delivery Paper, and Housing Land Supply Statement but to no avail. These documents simply state the number, but none provide an explanation of the calculation nor the actual calculation.

**Question (24-103Q)**

1. Please therefore can you provide the calculation and source date that underpins these numbers for Salisbury.

**Response**

The [Planning for Salisbury](#) document provides an explanation for the 60 homes proposed for the designated Salisbury neighbourhood area. This is for the period 2020 to 2038 and is referred to in Policy 22 (Salisbury Principal Settlement). This Policy also makes an allowance for 350 homes on small sites of less than 10 dwellings within the urban area over the plan period.

The draft Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 28 November 2024 following approval by Council on 15 October 2024. The appointed Inspector will assess the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan, taking into consideration the representations made on the Plan during the consultation last year including those relating to the proposed neighbourhood area designations.

**Question**

2. If you are not prepared to release this data to the public, then please would you explain this lack of transparency.

## **Response**

See above response.

### Statement 2

Your reply to my question at November's Cabinet about whether the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape had been consulted stated that "...the Cranborne Chase National Landscape Board has been consulted throughout the preparation of the Local Plan."

However, the Cranbourne Chase National Landscape's response to the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan is clear that there has been no prior discussion. It states: "It is also concerning that sites identified in policies 27 and 28 [Land South of Harnham and Land West of Coombe Road] have been put forward to public consultation without prior discussion with the AONB Partnership."

## **Question**

3. Please can you explain this difference of view?

## **Response**

The Cranbourne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Board (now referred to as a National Landscape Management Board) were consulted through both the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations undertaken as part of the Local Plan process. The position of the Management Board in respect of draft Policies 27 and 28, as set out in their representation will be a matter for the appointed Inspector to consider through the examination process.

**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; and**

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

---

Statement 1

Transport

Firstly, thank you for providing responses to my questions at the last Cabinet meeting on 19 November. They were very helpful in understanding the traffic/transport issues for Salisbury. I have some further questions which I would be grateful if you would consider and respond to.

At the last meeting, you responded to the following question:

**Question:** *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)*

**Question (24-104Q)**

1. I conclude from your response that the Local Plan’s Sustainability Assessment Objective 11 (Transport) for Sites 6, 8 & 9 was underpinned by (now) outdated transport modelling that only assumed Local Plan traffic growth to 2026 and not 2038 (Transport Evidence Base dated May 2023 refers), and that more recent modelling has now been undertaken (available at the web address – “Updated Evidence...”) but that the Sustainability Appraisal has not updated. Is that correct? I would be grateful for a simple “yes” or “no” answer, accompanied with a supporting narrative.

**Response**

Yes. The sustainability appraisal was a snapshot in time that took into consideration all available data. As the list of sites was whittled down, as a result of factors not exclusive to transport, further transport modelling and assessment was undertaken to



establish the impact of the progressed sites, which then formed the Transport Evidence Base and subsequent work.

### **Question**

2. If this is correct, given the updated Transport Modelling, would the Council now consider SA11 for Sites 6, 8 & 9 as 'major adverse effect'? If not, then it would be helpful to understand why?

### **Response**

No. Each of the three sites have been identified as imparting a moderate adverse effect, e.g. mitigation achievable but problematic. The assessment considered multi-modal access for the sites, raising concern for walkable/cyclable routes to the city centre and traffic impacts at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabouts.

Walking and cycling routes may be enhanced through developer contributions and delivery of the Salisbury Transport Strategy and a future revision of the strategy, but walking distances will not be reduced and topography will not change. In order to mitigate the walking and cycling accessibility concerns, sites were considered against existing and potential public transport connectivity and developer contributions will be sought to enhance bus accessibility for sites 8 and 9; site 6 has relatively good walking and cycling accessibility and is opposite Britford Park and Ride.

With regards to traffic impacts, sites 6, 8 and 9 rely upon the delivery of the proposed capacity enhancements at Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street roundabout, without which the sites would be considered to impart a 'major adverse' impact. The updated transport modelling does not present a 'severe' impact following the implementation of the Salisbury Junctions Improvements scheme.

### **Question**

3. Given that you have confirmed that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (September 2023) reflected the c. £17.5m 'A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements' that was actually cancelled and replaced in March 2022 by the current, smaller scheme, did the modelling in the Transport Evidence Base (May 2023) assume delivery of this £17.5m scheme and also the £6m 'A36 Southampton Road Upgrades'?

### **Response**

The future year modelling did include the currently planned improvements to Harnham Gyratory and Exeter Street Roundabout and are considered as 'more than likely' with an opening year of 2026 in the 'Uncertainty Log' held at Appendix A of the Baseline BAU (Business as Usual) Report, which itself forms Appendix A of the Transport Evidence Base (May 2023). No enhancements to Southampton Road are included in the future year modelling due to current uncertainty of delivery and design.

## Question

4. Please can you provide a clearer answer to my question about the Salisbury Transport Strategy (Q5) asked for the 19 November Cabinet meeting. The response didn't appear to make much sense (see below).

**Question:** *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.*

## Response

Policy 70 of the Wiltshire Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft 2020-2038 secures the 'developing [of] proportionate transport strategies for the Principal Settlements and Market Towns' and SU 3.9 of the draft Local Transport Plan 4 encompasses a 'refresh [of] our transport policies and plans'. The adoption of both plans will set a future baseline for a revised Salisbury Transport Strategy to address, and a programme will be put in place to commission and complete this work. The strategy will further reflect upon the work undertaken in the Transport Evidence Base, thereby utilising existing data and speeding up completion.

## Question

5. Finally, please could you explain why the Council is not being transparent with the residents of Salisbury on the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' webpage (<https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/4007/Salisbury-junction-improvements>) about the impact of Local Plan traffic growth to 2038?

## Response

The Salisbury Junction Improvements scheme was designed and assessed on the basis of known development and the current core strategy, alongside forecasts in traffic growth through to 2026. Until adopted, the Local Plan does not present a fixed forecast position and carries limited material weight. However, once adopted the Local Plan forecasts and modelling outputs may be incorporated within the 'Salisbury Junction Improvements' webpage.

The Local Plan assessment of impact upon the Salisbury Junction Improvements scheme is included in Local Plan supporting documents, specifically

[https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/14127/Transport-Topic-Paper-Appendix-B-A338-Salisbury-Local-Plan-VISSIM-Assessment/pdf/Transport\\_Topic\\_Paper\\_Appendix\\_B\\_A338\\_Salisbury\\_Local\\_Plan\\_VISSIM\\_Assessment.pdf?m=1727949340847](https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/14127/Transport-Topic-Paper-Appendix-B-A338-Salisbury-Local-Plan-VISSIM-Assessment/pdf/Transport_Topic_Paper_Appendix_B_A338_Salisbury_Local_Plan_VISSIM_Assessment.pdf?m=1727949340847).

### Question

6. Surely the Council should adopt a more honest and transparent approach by presenting, on the front page and in the Q&A, a position that accurately reflects the current modelling analysis up to 2038, along with a balanced view of the positives and negatives of the **‘Salisbury Junction Improvements’**?

### Response

Salisbury Junctions Improvements scheme webpage includes the following text:

*‘The current scheme has been designed and assessed on the basis of known development and the current Core strategy.*

*The emerging Local Plan is expected to result in proposals for additional housing in the county in order to meet Government targets. The nature and location of this development will be determined by the Local Plan process, which will use a similar traffic model to the scheme to ensure consistency.*

*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’.*

The Local Plan modelling outputs have been made available and are accessible within the Local Plan supporting documents. The Local Plan will identify necessary mitigation for traffic growth, which will include the Salisbury Junctions Improvements scheme and will build upon this in a revised Salisbury Transport Strategy which will follow adoption of the plan.

The Salisbury Junctions Improvements webpage may be updated when the Local Plan is adopted and presents a fixed policy direction for growth in the city.

**Agenda Item 6 – Devolution**

**Questions from Chris Caswill**

**To**

**Cllr Richard Clewer – Leader of the Council**

---

Statement 1

The revised letter to the Minister and the paper for the Cabinet meeting make it clear that the three LAs have rolled over on the issue of a regional mayor in response to the mix of bullying and financial inducement (some would say bribery) offered by the incoming Labour Government. At no stage have the public had any say in this proposed transformation, nor have the functional benefits of a regional Mayor been explained.

**Question (24-105Q)**

1. Would you please summarise the functional benefits of a regional Mayor for the citizens of Wiltshire - other than some more money for currently undisclosed purposes?
2. What if any consideration has been given to the impact on local democracy in Wiltshire of an inevitably distant set of Mayoral powers?
3. How will the public have any say at all in this so called devolution?

**Response**

The Deputy Prime Minister wrote to Leaders of councils in July 2024, inviting expressions of interest in devolution setting out preferred governance and geographies by the end of September, in line with high level criteria from the government. Discussions took place with leaders of neighbouring councils to establish the options that were open to us.

A revised expression of interest was submitted by the leaders of Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire Councils on 25 November following statements from Ministers and further informal discussion between leaders.

This, in itself, is not a formal decision to create a combined authority.

The Government are expected to issue their Devolution White Paper ahead of Christmas, which will clarify whether there are intended to be any changes to the legal requirements for the establishment of combined authorities (mayoral or non -

mayoral).

Under existing legislation, Councils wishing to establish a Combined Authority must carry out a governance review and publish a scheme recommending creation of the combined authority. There then follows a period of public consultation before any final scheme is implemented.

Whilst there was not a Full Council meeting in September in which to consider the submission of an expression of interest, the support of Full Council will be sought should our proposals progress further with government. This will include being invited to support any public consultation on a governance review and, following that consultation, any final proposal to establish a mayoral combined authority.

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

**Questions from Andrew Nicolson**

**To**

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

---

**Question (24-106Q)**

On the LTP4 Implementation Plan and business risks,

1. What is your provisional timetable for preparation, publication, consultation and adoption of the implementation plan to follow this mainly high-level generic phase of the LTP4?

**Response**

The draft LTP4 Core Strategy (page 71 onwards) sets out how we will deliver the proposed measures (subject to consultation) over the short (0-3 years) medium term (3-5 years) and long term (5 years plus). There are already a number of plans already in place such as the recently published Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) as well as a number of Local Cycling and walking infrastructure plans (LCWIPs). Currently there is uncertainty on Government funding which may be available to deliver some of these schemes. Once further detail emerges, the Council will be able to provide a more detailed update on any implementation plans. Following the public consultation, responses will be considered and a further draft of LTP4 will be presented to Cabinet for adoption. The programme will be dependent on the number of responses received during the consultation period.

**Question**

2. Given that DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan requires LTAs to deliver ambitious transport decarbonisation, - Quantifiable Carbon Reductions (QCR) - and that DfT funding will be allocated to LTAs according, in part, to the decarbonisation evidenced by their LTP's QCR, but that the draft LTP4 only bridges a low percentage of the 'emissions gap' between an optimistic business-as-usual scenario and an adequate carbon reduction pathway: how high or low does the Council rate its chances of drawing down the government funding it will need, to implement its LTP4 policies?

**Response**

The draft LTP4 is subject to public consultation, and we welcome all views. It should be noted that closing the remainder of the emissions gap is beyond the direct control

of Wiltshire Council and the influence of LTP4. It requires wider national and regional intervention to address emissions from transport trips, particularly freight trips and trips passing through the county. In addition, achieving the level of emissions reduction required would likely necessitate an underlying change in approach to private travel and car usage, changing the balance of cost and convenience between car and other modes. This would involve measures beyond those included in LTP4 and which are likely to be most effective if introduced at the regional or national level.

### **Question**

On consultation scope and stakeholders:

3. Your 19 November LTP4 officer report referred at paragraphs 11 and 12 to an Asset Management county-wide sub-strategy, to be included as a core county-wide policy. It seems to be absent from the consultation documents. What would a county-wide Asset Management sub-strategy cover, is it going ahead, If so, when is it to be published, or if not, what is your rationale for excluding it?

### **Response**

An Asset Management sub-strategy was considered as part of LTP4; however, the existing Asset Management Strategy (2019) and the recently published highways investment plan for 2024/25 negated the need to prioritise this within the draft LTP4. Further information on these documents can be found here [Highways maintenance - Wiltshire Council](#).

### **Question**

4. Overview and Scrutiny (report para 46). Environment Select Committee meets 14 Jan and 4 March 2025. How and when will they receive the Plan after the consultation and before adoption? And who were the 2023 key local and strategic stakeholders?

### **Response**

A range of key stakeholder were invited to inform preparation of the draft LTP4. Those who had representation at the Stakeholder Engagement workshops are listed below:

- Swindon and Wiltshire LEP
- Network Rail
- CPRE
- WECA
- National Highways
- Visit Wiltshire
- Business West
- National Highways

- British Horse Society
- National Farmers Union
- Natural England
- Option 24/7
- Wiltshire Climate Alliance
- TransWilts Community Rail Partnership
- Chippenham Town Council
- Wilcot and Huish with Oare Parish Council
- Malmesbury Area Board
- Cycling Opportunities Group for Salisbury
- Devizes Taxis
- Hullavington Parish Council
- Bulford Parish Council
- Calne Without Parish Council
- Westwood Parish Council
- Idmiston Parish Council
- Laverstock and Ford Parish Council
- Box Parish Council
- Wiltshire and Swindon Countryside Access Forum
- Chapmanslade Parish Council
- Wiltshire Council
- Center Parcs
- Hardenhuish School
- Broad Hinton and Winterbourne Basset Parish Council
- Wiltshire Council
- South Western Railway
- Good Energy PLC
- Burcombe Parish Council
- Marlborough Town Council
- Rushall Parish Council
- Wavin Group
- Corsham Town Council
- Malmesbury Area Board
- BANES Council
- Market Lavington Parish Council
- Salisbury, Southern and South West Wiltshire Area Boards
- Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group
- Apetito (Business)
- Cricklade Town Council
- Ludgershall Town Council
- Wiltshire 100 Business Manager
- Lydiard Tregoze Parish Council
- Manningford, Woodborough, Beechingstoke and Wilcot, Huish & Oare Parish Councils
- New Forest National Park Authority
- Area Board Member
- Sedgemoor and Semley Parish Council



- Wiltshire Council
- Amesbury Town Council

Presentation of LTP4 to the Environmental Select Committee will be dependent on the number of responses received during the consultation period, which closes on 24<sup>th</sup> January.

This page is intentionally left blank