



South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Topic Paper 14 Addendum 2:

Design

July 2009

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

TOPIC PAPER 14 ADDENDUM 2

DESIGN

JULY 2009

CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2 ISSUES AND OPTIONS**
- 3 PREFERRED OPTIONS**

APPENDIX ONE: SUGGESTED POLICIES AND MONITORING
APPENDIX TWO: MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN AREA ACTION PLANS
APPENDIX THREE: CHANGES AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY
APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING
REFINEMENT

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In June 2007 Salisbury District Council published Local Development Framework Topic Paper 14 'Design' ("The Topic Paper"). In February 2008, following consultation on options put forward within The Topic Paper, the Council published an Addendum to the Topic Paper ("The Addendum").
- 1.2 This second addendum should be read in conjunction with both The Topic Paper and The Addendum and it is not therefore considered necessary to repeat background information, national and regional policy, examples of best practice and community aspirations contained therein in detail.
- 1.3 The Council's desired outcome for this topic is to ensure that all development adheres to the fundamental principles of good urban design to create places with:
 - Character: its own identity.
 - Continuity and Enclosure: public and private spaces are clearly distinguished.
 - Quality of the Public Realm: attractive and successful outdoor areas.
 - Ease of Movement: easy to get to and move through.
 - Legibility: a clear image and is easy to understand.
 - Adaptability: can change easily.
 - Diversity: variety and choice.
- 1.4 In addition to the list above, incorporating inclusive design principles, applying sustainable design and construction measures and designing to deter crime and anti-social activity are also recognised as being integral to good urban design.
- 1.5 The Topic Paper analysed existing Local Plan design policies, noting that their core aims remain valid but recognising there are aspects of the policies that could be improved. Furthermore, it was suggested that there are significant design areas where there is a 'policy void'.
- 1.6 In summary, the areas of existing policy identified as requiring attention were as follows:
 - Insufficient guidance on the issues of internal and external space standards for residential development and more practical guidance on the layout of residential development generally.
 - Lack of reference to key urban design objectives, for example, providing links to surrounding neighbourhoods and shops, walkable neighbourhoods, etc.
 - Insufficient emphasis on inclusive design within and between buildings.
 - Insufficient emphasis on building flexible, multi-use buildings or buildings with the potential to change their use easily to reflect changing economic circumstances.
 - Insufficient emphasis and guidance on sustainable design and construction.

- Weak policy on public art.
- No policy/guidance on gated entrances to residential development – a persistent phenomenon.
- No reference to the use of lighting as a design feature.
- No references to latest best practice documents such as the ‘Manual for Streets’, ‘Code for Sustainable Homes’, etc.
- Little guidance on issues surrounding ‘back-land’ development.
- Insufficient emphasis on retaining trees and providing high-quality landscaping.
- No presumption against cul-de-sac layouts.

2 ISSUES AND OPTIONS

2.1 The suggestions listed above were included within the council's 'Our Place In The Future' Issues and Options consultation carried out in the summer of 2007.

2.2 The Addendum reviewed The Topic Paper, analysed the results of the public consultation on these options and examined relevant individual comments to ascertain if there were any additional areas that required investigation prior to the preparation of Preferred Options for this topic.

2.3 A significant majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:

- Buildings and places should be designed in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime.
- The '40ft rule' has served Salisbury well and should be retained.
- We should impose higher standards to raise the quality of design for new development.
- We should adopt clear design guidance for all new development.
- New development should address the needs of all – particularly the elderly and disabled.
- We should require developers to demonstrate the steps they have taken to reduce crime and make places safe

2.4 Respondents to 'Our Place In The Future' also had an opportunity to comment on the Salisbury Vision, some elements of which were concerned with design issues. A significant majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with proposals to:

- Invest in the public areas of the city and create new high quality public spaces.
- Upgrade public areas through the implementation of high quality new seats, signs, lighting, and surface treatments.
- Enhance the Market Square.
- Create distinct character areas.

3 **PREFERRED OPTIONS**

- 3.1 The proposals identified above were subjected to a number of tests including sustainability appraisal, deliverability and conformity with national and regional policy. As a result The Addendum identified the following as options that should be considered further:
- Buildings and places should be designed in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime: require developers to demonstrate the steps they have taken to reduce crime and make places safe.
 - Retain the '40 foot rule' restricting the height of new buildings in Salisbury.
 - Replace Salisbury's '40 foot rule' with a more flexible approach.
 - Introduce a '50 foot rule' for all new planning applications.
 - Impose higher standards to raise the quality of design for new development.
 - Produce and adopt clear design guidance for all new development.
 - New development should address the needs of all – particularly the elderly and disabled.
 - The Design and Access statement requirement for new development should be referred to in the LDF.
 - Environmentally friendly design code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM in accordance with sustainability appraisal objectives.
- 3.2 The Council carried out consultation on a wide range of Core Strategy Preferred Options in the spring of 2008, of which those referred to below were of relevance to this topic.
- 3.3 The Golden Threads listed under Preferred Option PO1 identified that we should ensure 'All our decisions are truly in the best interests of sustainability'.
- 3.4 The Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives listed under Preferred Option PO3 included Objective K: 'Where high quality design is expected and delivered as a matter of course and new buildings which complement the south Wiltshire vernacular tradition enhance the visual appeal of the district'.
- 3.5 Preferred Option PO20 proposed that 'Buildings and places should be designed in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime and improve the quality of the urban environment. Developers should contribute toward preventative measures such as CCTV, lighting and community policing. We will encourage the retrofitting of measures such as 'homezones'.'
- 3.6 Preferred Option PO26 proposed that new development of all types would require high quality design based on the following:
- The design of new buildings and spaces must address the causes and impacts of global warming but still respect local heritage and character.

- There is a need to sustain local identity in our city, towns and villages through the sensitive design and appearance of new developments.
- Too many of our new housing estates are still not meeting basic design standards. We need to look at establishing a policy framework, which sets out clear standards, guidance and skills to ensure a consistent and objective scrutiny of the design quality of new proposals and then delivers high quality outcomes.
- We need to ensure that the design of new buildings addresses the needs of the district's unique population profile, especially as a reflection of our ageing population.
- Fear of crime is the top concern expressed by our communities and hence we need to ensure that developers demonstrate how they have taken steps to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour to make places feel safe.
- A high standard of design of all buildings, streets and spaces, respectful of their context will be required of all developments.

3.7 Preferred Option PO38 set out the following for improving the quality of design in the Salisbury and Wilton Community Areas:

- Maintaining a policy that effectively protects the treasured views of the cathedral, but to consider updating it in a manner that allows some flexibility in locations where it is unequivocally proven that some increased height would have no negative impacts.
- The growth of Salisbury and Wilton must not lead to coalescence. All development must be located and designed to ensure that the breathing space between the settlements is maintained and their distinct sense of place is not compromised.
- The urban renaissance of the heart of Salisbury could be secured through implementation of the Salisbury Vision in a manner that respects and enhances the unique built heritage of the city, particularly the Chequers, Cathedral Close and Market Place.

3.8 Preferred Option PO49 set out the following for improving the quality of design in the Stonehenge Community Area:

- Ensuring that the managed growth in Amesbury and other settlements does not repeat mistakes of the past and instead reflects the best vernacular traditions with a sense of place in which people want to live.
- There will need to be a comprehensive planning brief and master plan to ensure that the design of any new settlement or urban extension is an exemplar of quality design and environmental high standards.
- Any housing or employment allocation will require a comprehensive planning brief and master plan to ensure the design is an exemplar of quality and meets environmental high standards. This will include refreshing existing briefs such as those for Solstice Park and Archers Gate.
- A comprehensive review of Amesbury town centre to see how a vibrant, high quality environment can be delivered, which is more fitting of the town of such size.

- A strategic review of the urban layout of Durrington to see if a solution can be developed which concentrates and enhances the retail uses on offer in a high quality redevelopment.
- 3.9 Preferred Option PO60 set out the following for improving the quality of design in the Mere Community Area:
- Ensuring that the managed growth in Mere and other settlements reflects the best vernacular traditions with a sense of place in which people want to live.
 - A strategy to improve the quality of buildings, building on the work in ‘Creating Places’ (the district-wide design guide), Salisbury Design Forum, peer group review, benchmarking and continued specialist design advice.
- 3.10 Preferred Option PO71 set out the following for improving the quality of design in the Southern Community Area:
- Ensuring that the managed growth in Downton, Laverstock, Alderbury and other settlements reflects the best vernacular traditions with a sense of place in which people want to live.
 - A strategy to improve the quality of buildings, building on the work in ‘Creating Places’, Salisbury Design Forum, peer group review, benchmarking and continued specialist design advice.
- 3.11 Preferred Option PO82 set out the following for improving the quality of design in the Nadder Community Area:
- Ensuring that the managed growth in Tisbury and other settlements reflects the best vernacular traditions with a sense of place in which people want to live.
- 3.12 43% of respondents supported the list of Golden Threads identified under PO1. A further 33% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that ensuring all our decisions are truly in the best interests of sustainability formed part of a list and none of the 24% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with suggestions as to additional Golden Threads and how other Preferred Options would impact on those already identified, including sustainability.
- 3.13 Comments made by respondents included the following:
- The [Parish] Council agrees that your policy work should be underpinned by the Golden Threads as listed.
 - The core values and assets identified to be respected in development of policies and proposals are comprehensive and relevant and will provide for district wide and locally appropriate policies.

- The Golden Threads should include the following additional theme: Everything we do will be underpinned by a quality approach.
- The whole document seeks to undermine the qualities that make south Wiltshire special. The regional strategy should be challenged in every way.

3.14 23% of respondents supported the list of Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives identified under PO3. A further 49% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that the objective relating to high quality design formed part of a list and none of the 28% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with the wording of policies and the impact of major development in the south Wiltshire area.

3.15 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- New developments being addressed at early stages to design out crime are essential to build sustainable, prosperous communities for the future.
- I support the objectives but I do not believe SDC has appropriate policies for achieving it. More of the same will worsen not improve the environment.
- I agree that design of new buildings is currently poor.
- We agree with statements A-L for the core Strategy Spatial Vision in general.
- This is all a lot of nonsense, my opinion will not matter, they will be done whatever us people say.
- I think the city should discourage littering, and therefore get more bins, and also encourage recycling so should get recycling bins as well.

3.16 54% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO20 to design buildings and places in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime and maintain and enhance the rural economy. A further 27% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. Analysis of comments made by the 19% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with wording of actual policies and a potential proliferation of CCTV cameras.

3.17 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Crime reduction should be an integral part of the planning process and incorporated as early as possible in the process.
- Crime isn't caused by buildings and development. It's caused by people. CCTV will help.
- Absolutely against more CCTV cameras. This country is becoming like George Orwell's vision. A reduction would be better.
- Emphasis on maintaining and improving existing communities is sound and has to be supported.
- Spend developers' money on transport and not addressing a non-existent crime problem.

3.18 63% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO26 to secure high quality design. A further 34% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. Analysis of the few comments made by the 3% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with potential development in Harnham and potential proliferation of CCTV cameras.

3.19 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- How can you ensure high standard homes when there would be price restraint: ie social housing?
- Generally support PO26 but definitely think it is essential that the current policy of a maximum of 12.2 metre building line should be upheld to protect spire views.
- I agree that this is a very good plan and will make developers consider their options very seriously.
- Agree. Would add that the landscaping and 'place shaping' are also very important as well. A more imaginative approach to traffic management would also be desirable.
- Salisbury Civic Society has long been concerned about design quality in new housing developments. The Planning Authority needs to take a much stronger line when detailed planning proposals are made.
- This is absolutely essential to preserve the character of this area.

3.20 14% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO38 for improving the quality of design in the Salisbury and Wilton area. A further 10% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. Although 76% of respondents registered an objection to this Preferred Option, analysis of their comments indicates that they were almost exclusively concerned with any implication that policies aimed at protecting views of the cathedral might be revised or abolished.

3.21 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- It is essential that the 40-foot rule in Salisbury is retained; any modification will inevitably introduce flexibility in the planning regime, which will be exploited by developers.
- Salisbury is unique in retaining its historic character. On no account should this be compromised by raising the height limit of building in the city.
- My ward constituents do not want us to remove the 40-foot rule under any circumstances.
- Please keep the height of building limit at least within the city, and if possible restrict any district/village development from being on 'horizon'.
- I strongly support this option's intention to prevent the coalescence of Salisbury and Wilton - the antidote to potential sprawl.

3.22 73% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO49 for improving the quality of design in the Stonehenge area. Analysis of the

comments made by the 27% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern over large development proposals, particularly in the Durrington area, and whether there is any real need to refresh existing development briefs.

3.23 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- We support the managed growth of Amesbury to ensure it remains a place that people want to live.
- We support the requirement for comprehensive planning briefs and master plans for significant new development proposals. We also support the move to refresh existing briefs.
- As a local resident, I would certainly wish to contribute to any strategy that can help to regenerate the Amesbury/Durrington area.
- This is another great opportunity to ensure that the ‘best vernacular traditions’ are kept alive by really using local building techniques that will die out if not used.

3.24 77% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO60 for improving the quality of design in the Mere area. A further 23% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. None of the respondents objected to this Preferred Option.

3.25 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I agree that all new developments within Mere should be based on traditional designs and using materials of construction which are totally in keeping with the existing old buildings.
- Smaller villages to take their share of development.
- Whilst these initiatives are welcomed and the need to ensure a locally distinctive document is recognised, might they also apply equally to all other areas of the district?

3.26 67% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO71 for improving the quality of design in the Southern area. A further 25% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. No comments were made by the 8% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option.

3.27 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- ‘Vernacular traditions’ - The Downton Society would not want a ‘Disney’ village - we would wish contemporary designs also to be given consideration.
- ‘Creating Places’ and the Design Forum have both begun to make a difference. Their work should be built on so that more sites have a better Design Statement and these are more tightly and enthusiastically used to ensure quality.

- Support PO71 as one of the key mechanisms for involving and securing support from local community groups as well as other stakeholders so that the provision of well designed and much needed housing can be accepted as an integral part of settlements rather than as an adjunct.
- 3.28 54% of respondents supported the proposals suggested under PO82 for improving the quality of design in the Nadder area. A further 46% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. No respondents objected to this Preferred Option.
- 3.29 Comments made by respondents included the following:
- These proposals refer to the design of individual buildings. Whilst this is important, there should also be a commitment to consider the scale and location of developments. However high the ‘quality’ of new buildings, too many of them in the wrong place will damage irreparably the character of the area.
 - PO82 is particularly important to preserve the character of the area upon which other matters depend including attracting employment opportunities and tourism.
- 3.30 The council undertook a second stage of Preferred Options consultation in the autumn of 2008. The consultation document noted the need to ensure that new buildings are of a very high quality to ensure they complement and enhance our district, rather than spoil its character. At this stage, there was also a firm proposal that the policy limiting the height of new buildings within the Salisbury ring road should be retained.
- 3.31 Although a specific question regarding this topic was not asked at this second stage of consultation, there was an opportunity for respondents to make additional comments, including on previous Preferred Options. These responses have been examined and it is considered that no new issues requiring further investigation have been raised in respect of this topic.

APPENDIX ONE: SUGGESTED POLICIES AND MONITORING

Taking into account the rigorous processes, consultation and analysis undertaken by the Council and outlined above, it was considered appropriate to include the following policies within the Core Strategy.

Policy A: Housing Density and the Efficient Use of Land

Developers will be required to demonstrate how proposals make effective use of land through the delivery of new dwellings at the highest density compatible with the creation of an attractive living environment and the local context of building patterns.

Density will vary from site to site but should normally be within the range of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Higher densities will be sought in and around Salisbury city centre, and other areas with good transport links. There may be justification for lower densities where environmental or historic issues dictate.

The redevelopment of previously developed land will be permitted where it accords with all other policies within this Core Strategy. Advice to developers on how to achieve this requirement is contained in the south Wiltshire design guide entitled 'Creating Places'.

TARGETS

An average density on each strategic site of not less than 30 dwellings per hectare; A minimum of 25% new dwellings on Brownfield land.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Annual Monitoring Review; Housing Trajectory.

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers; Strategic Partnerships.

Policy B: Creating High Quality Places

New development will be permitted where the proposals are compatible with the provisions of 'Creating Places: the South Wiltshire Design Guide' in that they improve their surroundings (including the Public Realm where appropriate) in terms of the following:

- The layout and form of existing and proposed development and, where appropriate, the historic pattern of the layout;
- Any features or open spaces, buildings and/or structures of character on or adjoining the site;
- The scale and character of the existing townscape in terms of building heights, building line, plot size, density, elevational design and materials;
- The scale and use of spaces between buildings;
- Views/vistas afforded from within, over and out of the site;

- Any existing important landscape features and the nature and scope of new landscaping proposed within and around the edges of the site;
- The roofscape/skyline long or medium distance views; and
- Adequate consideration has been given to waste and recycling matters

TARGETS

100% of development delivered under the Core Strategy to be in accordance with the principles of 'Creating Places'.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Development quality assessments based on CABE criteria; South Wiltshire Design Forum review; Appeal outcomes for proposals refused on design grounds.

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers; South Wiltshire Design Forum.

Policy C: Community Safety

New buildings and places should be designed to incorporate the principles of 'Homezones', in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime and improves the quality of the urban environment.

Developers should provide and/or contribute toward preventative measures such as CCTV, lighting and community policing.

The retro-fitting of measures such as 'Homezones' will be encouraged.

TARGETS

A reduction in crime and fear of crime in all Community Areas.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Community planning consultation; Feedback through Area Boards: Liaison with Police.

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers; South Wiltshire Strategic Alliance; The Police.

Policy D: The Salisbury Skyline

In the Salisbury Central Area:

- New development will be restricted to a height that does not exceed 12.2 metres above ground level;
- Decorative architectural features that positively contribute to the variety, form and character of the area's roofscape, skyline and silhouette may be allowed to

exceed 12.2 metres in height where appropriate, provided that they do not result in any increase in usable floorspace.

- In exceptional circumstances, development in excess of 12.2 metres in height will be permitted where, in the interests of making the most efficient use of land, it can be demonstrated that it would have no demonstrable harm on the roofscape and views of the Cathedral and would be important for the long-term economic viability of the city.

TARGETS

No approvals as exception to policy.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Annual Monitoring Report

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers

Policy E: Public Realm Improvements

The Local Planning Authority will establish a rolling programme of environmental enhancement measures to be implemented in south Wiltshire, including at Salisbury Market Square, as financial and technical resources permit.

Schemes of environmental improvement as part of development schemes will be encouraged.

TARGETS

No approvals as exception to policy.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Annual Monitoring Report; Reviews of Salisbury Vision.

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers.

APPENDIX TWO: MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN AREA ACTION PLANS

The following matters are considered to be area-specific and should therefore be included in Area Action Plans, as opposed to overarching Core Strategy policies.

Salisbury, Wilton and Four Rivers Community Area

- Ensuring that development between Salisbury and Wilton does not lead to coalescence.
- Securing the urban renaissance of the heart of Salisbury through implementation of Salisbury Vision projects in a manner that respects and enhances the unique built heritage of the city.

Stonehenge Community Area

- Reviewing Amesbury town centre to ensure delivery of a vibrant, high quality environment, more fitting of the town of its size.
- Reviewing the urban layout of Durrington to investigate whether retail uses can be concentrated within a high quality redevelopment.

APPENDIX THREE

CHANGES AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING REFINEMENT

This initial policy text was then subjected to Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment as well as editing refinement and advice from parties such as GOSW. As a result of this the following amendments were made to the text to ensure conformity with both European Directives as well as ensuing central and regional policy are not repeated and future editing ensured.

The issue of the Salisbury Skyline was addressed in Core Policy 45 of Draft 3 of the Submission Document. Due to various iterations, Draft 13 of the Submission Document resulted in the policy being redrafted as below, as Core Policy 8:

Salisbury Skyline

In the Salisbury Central Area, as shown on the Proposals Map:

- New development will be restricted to a height that does not exceed 12.2 metres above ground level;
- Decorative architectural features that positively contribute to the variety, form and character of the area's roofscape, skyline and silhouette may be allowed to exceed 12.2 metres in height where appropriate, provided that they do not result in any increase in usable floorspace.
- In exceptional circumstances, development in excess of 12.2 metres in height will be permitted, where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development:
 - (a) would have no demonstrable harm on the roofscape of the city and/or views of the cathedral;
 - (b) would be essential for the long-term economic viability of the city; and
 - (c) the height is required to ensure the development is making the most efficient use of the land.

Targets: No approval as exceptions to policy

Monitoring and Review: AMR

Delivery Responsibility: Wiltshire Council

Policies replaced: D6

The SA noted that this policy would help to protect the distinctive historic landmark of the cathedral spire, which would in turn have indirect benefits for the economy and design standards. The only negative impact identified was that the policy would reduce potential for the efficient use of land. However, the policy does have flexibility where economic benefit and no harm to the skyline can be demonstrated. No mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made.

No requirement was identified for examination of this policy at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

Although Core Policy 8 will be applied as a development management policy, there is flexibility allowed beyond current Local Plan policy, which will aid delivery of the aims of the Local Development Framework. The Policy as drafted above should therefore be included within the Core Strategy.

The remaining design topics were addressed in a range of Core Policies of Draft 3 of the Submission Document, viz:

Core Policy 7: Housing Density and The Efficient Use Of Land

Core Policy 8: Creating High Quality Places

Core Policy 10: Community Safety

Core Policy 46: Public Realm Improvements

Regarding Core Policy 7, the SA noted that the Council is constrained in achieving government targets for housing development on previously developed land, due to the limited supply of previously developed sites in South Wiltshire, but aimed to encourage development of previously developed land and higher density development where appropriate in Salisbury city centre, and other areas with good transportation links.

The policy would have positive effects for objectives on housing, safety, air quality and greenhouse gas reduction. Through ensuring the efficient use of land, the policy would help minimise the effects on landscape and biodiversity. The policy would also promote high-quality development and enhance existing urban areas.

Some negative effects were identified for objectives on health, greenhouse gases and air quality and road safety and congestion, as the intensification of development in urban areas is likely to lead to increased disturbance, including traffic congestion, noise and air pollution in existing areas. However, these negative effects can be conditioned through appropriate development phasing, the development application process and through strong policies encouraging sustainable transport.

The following mitigation and enhancement recommendations were made:

- Stronger policies on sustainable transportation.
- Construction effects to be minimised through conditions of consent.
- Consideration to be given to cumulative effects of construction (congestion, noise and air pollution) when phasing development.
- 'Previously developed land will be permitted' could be changed to 'previously developed land will be encouraged' - this would help to strengthen the Core Strategy commitment to developing brownfield land.
- The phrase 'There may be justification for lower densities where environmental or historic issues dictate' could be reworded, for example: 'There may be instances where lower densities can be justified where environmental or historic issues dictate', to assert that such cases are exceptions to the rule and that the policy is therefore in accordance with Government policy on development density.

Core Policy 8 would have positive benefits through enhancing the built environment, and minimising the effect of new development on existing buildings, streetscapes and surrounding landscapes. In addition to positive effects for objectives relating to social

inclusion, homes, open spaces, health and well-being and high standard development, there would be positive, indirect effects for objectives relating to safety, biodiversity and maintaining the viability of existing businesses in town centres.

Core Policy 10 would have long-term positive effects of cohesion, wellbeing and vitality. The policy recognises that developers have an important role to play in enhancing community safety for the benefit of both new and existing communities.

Core Policy 46 was recognised as a very positive policy, which would have significant social, economic and environmental benefits. The potential for adverse impact was identified in relation to riverbank management, as the needs for enhancement and biodiversity might not be compatible.

No mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made in respect of the SA of Core Policies 7, 8, 10 or 46, and no requirement was identified for examination of these policies at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

However, following iteration, these policies were deleted from Draft 7 as they represented development management policies, which will be delivered through a Wiltshire-wide DPD.