

Appendix II: Consultation Responses - Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stage

Comment	Comment /response
Issues and Options	
<p>Government Office of the South West Further work on the Core Strategy at issues and options stage should develop more locally specific objectives and options to be consulted on. This further work, alongside the sustainability appraisal of the document, will help to measure the benefits and disadvantages of different spatial options for the future development for the District.</p> <p>Although titled an issues and options paper, and acknowledging that options are listed within the various topic papers on your website, it does not appear to set out clear spatial options that describe how places might change over the next 20 years.</p>	<p>Further spatial options, in relation to the location of development areas were subject to consultation in the documents: Identification of strategic growth areas- Papers 1 and 2. The proposed growth areas were then subject to detailed SA in December 2009 and are reported in this SA report.</p>
Preferred Options	
<p>English Heritage</p> <p>Highlight the potential significant impacts, but concern that SEA does not address negative impacts. Examples given include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of PO29 against all 23 sustainability objectives states there will only be 'positive' or 'no impact'. Not even the suggestion of an 'uncertain' impact is considered. Such an unconditional view is surprising. • 800 additional homes at Old Sarum won't even potentially, have an adverse impact on Objective 16 - to conserve and enhance the district's landscapes or 23 - to protect, maintain and improve the recognised built heritage and 	<p>Agree that the work undertaken by Salisbury District Council on the Preferred Options has focused on the positive sustainability aspects of development, but has omitted a number of negative aspects. Some opportunities to provide recommendations for mitigation at this stage in the process were therefore missed.</p> <p>However this has now been rectified through further detailed SA work undertaken in December 2008 (SA of Growth Areas) and in April-May 2009 (SA of early pre-submission draft), followed by further SA work of a more final pre-submission draft in June /July 2009.</p> <p>All the policies in the pre-submission draft have been subject to detailed</p>

Comment	Comment /response
<p>cultural assets of the district?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PO51 includes substantial levels of development in the district's rural hinterland characterised by historic settlements within sensitive landscapes. <p>This tends to call into question the objectivity and therefore validity of the process. We may not challenge the spatial strategy itself but ask for a more measured assessment of the likely impacts of it throughout the whole of the SA report to ensure a reasonable evaluation is possible and subsequent soundness of the DPD.</p> <p>English Heritage has considerable concern with an additional 800 new homes 'around Old Sarum' in addition to, and in light of, the evident impact of the new development currently under construction. English Heritage cannot support the principle of sizeable new development around Old Sarum. In our opinion this matter affects the soundness of the plan due to the inconsistency with PPG 15 and 16. Whilst it is recognised the Allocations DPD will identify specific development sites, due to the considerable scale of development advocated, this Core Strategy must demonstrate to a greater extent, now rather than later, the environmental capacity of all localities effected and the SEA must be clear of the impact on sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This scale of change advocated in and around the pattern of dispersed settlements will obviously have a profound effect on the landscape and settlement character. The DPD must clearly indicate how growth can be accommodated in these situations without sporadic encroachment into open countryside and if not, how can it be managed? Will settlement boundaries be established? How will the tranquillity, the narrow characteristic lanes etc. be affected? Currently the SEA appears less than candid about the impact of the change envisaged.</p>	<p>sustainability appraisal, including assessment of both positive and negative aspects. This has provided opportunities for the SA recommendations to be taken on board in the current pre-submission draft.</p> <p>Considerable work has since been undertaken by Council in Appraising the capacity of sites, detailed in the documents: Identification of Strategic Growth Areas (Papers 1 and 2). Further Sustainability Appraisal of the Strategic Growth Areas emerging from this work was undertaken by Enfusion with Council Officers in 2008 and is contained in Appendix V of this document. The SA has raised concerns about the implications of development for a number of growth areas and this is illustrated in Appendix V.</p> <p>As for previous comments, new SA work has been undertaken on the Draft Pre-submission Document, and has identified both positive and negative effects of the plan, including cumulative effects. Recommendations have been made regarding the development of strategic sites and the overall development strategy to minimise the sustainability effects that may occur due to the scale of development proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>

Comment	Comment /response
<p>Washbourne Greenwood Development planning</p> <p>Strong reservations about scenarios 1 and 3- principally because: The evidence to assess these proposals at Porton Down and Firsdow is completely absent in both the Core Strategy and the SHLAA- and is therefore unsound; No spatially specific plan indicates where these sites might be at Porton Down and/or Firsdow- contrary to current Government advice; No SEA has been prepared for these options; and in the absence of this key information, the council has not brought forward a sound Core Strategy- even at this preliminary stage- either in terms of facts or procedurally- potentially leaving the document open to legal review and challenge.</p>	<p>A detailed SA/SEA of the new Porton Down policy is provided in Appendix IV, including recommendation relating to habitats and the need for green travel plans. Recommendations from both the HRA and SA have been taken on board in the revision of this document, hence addressing the concerns raised relating to procedure.</p>