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1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction and background

1.1.1 Wiltshire Council is in the process of preparing a Core Strategy document which, when adopted, will be the key document within the Local Development Framework (LDF) for Wiltshire. The Core Strategy will set the framework for future development across Wiltshire and replace the current Local Plans of the former Wiltshire district councils.

1.1.2 This Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report has been published to accompany the Core Strategy. Sustainability appraisal is a process that is carried out as an integral part of developing the Core Strategy, with the aim of promoting sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations. It is a mandatory requirement and is subject to the same level of public consultation and scrutiny as the Core Strategy.

1.1.3 Sustainability appraisal is an ongoing process and this interim report follows on from the first draft1 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, published in October 2009, which accompanied the initial publication stage of the Core Strategy.2

1.2 Sustainability appraisal – purpose and requirements

1.2.1 The purpose of sustainability appraisal is to promote the objectives of sustainable development within planning policy. This is done by appraising the social, environmental and economic effects of a plan from the outset and in doing so, helping to ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in the preparation of development plans (further information on this is given in Section 2).

1.2.2 Planning authorities should ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in their development plans. In particular, they should carefully consider the inter-relationship between:

- social inclusion
- protecting and enhancing the environment
- the prudent use of natural resources
- economic development

1.2.3 Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 states that “the sustainability appraisal should perform a key role in providing a sound evidence base for the plan…and should inform the evaluation of alternatives. Sustainability assessment should provide a powerful means of providing to decision makers, and the public, that the plan is the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives”.

1 "Wiltshire Sustainability Appraisal Report’ (Wiltshire Council, October 2009).

2 ‘Wiltshire 2026 – Planning for Wiltshire’s Future’ (Wiltshire Council, October 2009).
1.2.4 Sustainability appraisals also help to deliver the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. The 2005 UK Sustainable Development Strategy defines the goal of sustainable development as “to enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life, without compromising the quality of life of future generations”.

1.2.5 The sustainability appraisal process is governed by European and national legislation, supported by government policy, which includes:

- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and PPS12, which requires consideration of sustainability appraisal for all emerging Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents

- The requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC (often known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive) which requires the preparation of an environmental report that considers the significant environmental effects of a plan or programme. This Directive is transposed into UK law by *The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004: Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633 (SEA Regulations)*

1.2.6 This sustainability appraisal incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive, by combining the more environmentally-focused considerations of SEA with wider social and economic effects. This report will clearly show how the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met - throughout this report, the requirements are signposted at the beginning of each section (where relevant); requirements are also presented as a complete table in Appendix A.

1.3 The Wiltshire Core Strategy

1.3.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy will form the principal Development Plan Document (DPD) within Wiltshire’s Local Development Framework (LDF) and will be a key consideration in the determination of planning applications. The LDF is the collection of *local development documents* produced by the local planning authority which collectively delivers the spatial planning strategy for the area.

1.3.2 The consultation document comprises a draft of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. This draft builds on the Wiltshire 2026 consultation which was undertaken in 2009, and previous consultation exercises undertaken by the former district councils of Kennet, North Wiltshire, Salisbury and West Wiltshire. However, this is the first time that a complete draft of the Wiltshire Core Strategy has been presented.

1.3.3 The Core Strategy includes:

- an overall vision which sets out how Wiltshire and the places within it will develop
- strategic objectives for the area focussing on key issues
a delivery strategy for achieving these objectives, setting out how much development is intended to happen, where, when, and by what means it will be delivered
• locations for strategic development
• evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed
• clear arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the strategy.

1.3.4 The Wiltshire 2026 draft, published in October 2009, was subject to sustainability appraisal. A summary of the main findings of that sustainability appraisal is reported in section 4 of this report. However, the report can be viewed or downloaded from the council’s website.

South Wilts Core Strategy

1.3.5 The South Wilts Core Strategy, covering the former Salisbury district area, has been produced as a separate document, with its own associated Sustainability Appraisal Report. The reason for this is because work on the former Salisbury District Core Strategy was sufficiently well advanced prior to local government reorganisation in April 2009.

1.3.6 The South Wilts Core Strategy has been subject to a review following the revocation of the South West Regional Spatial Strategy in 2010. However, it is the intention to adopt that document in 2011. After adoption, it will in effect be a transitional document, eventually to be replaced by the Wiltshire wide Core Strategy.

1.3.7 Where appropriate, this Sustainability Appraisal Report will take account of the findings of the South Wilts Core Strategy sustainability appraisal, but will not attempt to carry out any new appraisal work of policies relating to that area of Wiltshire, unless any significant changes are made to those policies.

1.4 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

1.4.1 European Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (the Habitats Directive) requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken on the Core Strategy. In the UK, the Habitats Directive is implemented through the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the “Habitats Regulations”).

1.4.2 The HRA assesses any impacts of the Core Strategy against the conservation objectives of sites of European importance for nature conservation in, and outside Wiltshire, to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity of any sites concerned. These sites, often just referred to as European sites, consist of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Offshore Marine Site (OMS). Sites designated under the Ramsar Convention (known as Ramsar sites) also receive the same degree of protection under Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9) (ODPM, 2005) as a matter of planning policy.
1.4.3 Wiltshire Council appointed WSP Environmental Consultants to undertake the HRA requirements for the Wiltshire Core Strategy. It is important that the sustainability appraisal takes account of HRA findings in order that consideration can be given to mitigating any adverse effects. The HRA process is an iterative one and it will be reviewed and amended as the Core Strategy develops.

1.4.4 A separate HRA Report has been produced for the South Wilts Core Strategy and this can be viewed at: http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/corestrategysustainabilityappraisal.htm

**HRA Screening**

1.4.5 An HRA screening exercise, or Screening Report, was published alongside the ‘Wiltshire 2026’ document in October 2009. This can be viewed at: http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/wiltshire2026.htm

1.4.6 A key concept within HRA guidance is that of screening ie identifying those elements of the plan where it can be concluded with reasonable certainty that no significant impact on a European site will occur. This report was carried out in discussion with a Steering Group comprising of representatives from Natural England, the Environment Agency and Wiltshire Council, and involved the following tasks:

- Identifying European sites within Wiltshire, and up to 15km from the boundary of Wiltshire Council local authority area (and therefore within the potential influence of the Core Strategy), and the characteristics of those sites.

- Detailed consideration of selected spatial options to highlight potential effects and any opportunities for avoidance measures to be incorporated in policies within the Core Strategy, lower level plans and projects.

- Identification of spatial options and European sites that can be screened out from any further assessment.

1.4.7 In total, the screening report identified 26 separate European sites, of which 11 were entirely or partly in Wiltshire. Effects on these sites were then considered in relation to the following issues that could potentially result from additional housing, employment and supporting infrastructure that is proposed in the Core Strategy:

- Potential for increased recreational pressure
- Hydrogeology/hydrology, including:
  - potential changes to the hydrological regime of catchment areas
  - potential for pollution of surface or ground water
  - potential for nutrient enrichment of aquatic systems
  - issues around increased water abstraction.
• Potential for effects on European sites associated with air pollution.
• Potential physical damage due to housing provision/transport infrastructure development
• Potential for in-combination effects associated with developments and potential mineral extraction

1.4.8 The report concludes that there is uncertainty as to whether or not the Core Strategy will have adverse effects on the integrity of European sites, and that further HRA assessment will be necessary considering the Habitats Regulations requirement to follow a precautionary approach.

1.4.9 The main area of uncertainty relates to Warminster Sewage Treatment Works and the impact that additional development might have on water quality in the River Avon SAC. There are also issues relating to potential impacts on European Sites resulting from recreational pressure, potential impacts relating to poor air quality (mainly resulting from transport) and potential issues associated with development in proximity of Bath and Bradford on Avon SAC because of its importance to bats.

1.4.10 Of these issues, based on the information available to date, only the issues associated with Warminster STW should influence the distribution of development at the settlement level. The other issues should be capable of being avoided or mitigated and the Core Strategy has a role in providing the policy hooks that will help ensure that measures are put in place.

Wiltshire Core Strategy HRA Report – June 2011

1.4.11 The requirements for HRA have been explained earlier in this section. An HRA Report has been published alongside the Wiltshire Core Strategy and should be read in conjunction with this Sustainability Appraisal Report. The key findings and recommendations of the HRA have been taken account of in this report and these recommendations must also be considered in Core Strategy policy. The conclusions of the HRA Report follow:

1.4.12 The thematic policies go some way to ensuring that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of European sites. The review of the policies against the criteria developed by Natural England has helped highlight areas that need strengthening and potential policy gaps, key points are:

- Policy relating to the provision of SANGS needs to be sharpened – Policy 33 needs to make it clear that there is potential for effects on other European sites, not just Salisbury Plain and the New Forest SPA.

- The quantum and location of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) that needs to be provided should be identified somewhere. The Green Infrastructure Strategy has a key role but the Core Strategy will have more weight. The characteristics of sites that quality as SANG should also be set out (see box on SANGS above).
The provision of SANG is necessary to be able to demonstrate that the Core Strategy will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites and should therefore be identified as critical infrastructure.

In relation to potential impacts on the River Avon SAC it can be concluded that, provided development can be accommodated within the existing headroom of the Sewage Treatment Works and the Nutrient Management Plan is implemented, there should be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Avon SAC arising from the Core Strategy.

It is recommended that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy.

It is recommended that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

The HRA process is predicated on the basis that the Core Strategy should not make an existing situation worse. As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

Policy 31 sets out the need for additional Gypsy and Travellers sites and locational criteria. It is recommended that an additional criterion is added relating to the avoidance of locations that might impact on European sites’.

1.4.13 In terms of the Community Areas the key points are:

- ‘Issues relating to potential effects on water quality associated with development in the Warminster Community Area have been addressed by Policies 50 and 51. It can therefore be concluded that the Core Strategy will not give rise to significant adverse effects on the River Avon SAC.

- Issues relating to potential impacts associated with disturbance and other effects on Salisbury Plain and other European sites would be addressed by Policies 33, 35 and 36 relating to Green Infrastructure but these need to be strengthened as suggested in this report. It would therefore be premature to conclude at this stage that there are no significant adverse effects on Salisbury Plain and other European sites associated with recreational pressure. The Draft Core Strategy is moving in the right direction but needs to
go further by identifying the quantum of SANGS that is required and its broad location. This could be covered in the thematic policies, rather than Community Areas, recognising that some SANGS could serve more than one area.

- Issues relating to air quality cannot be assigned to specific Community Areas at this time; more information is needed so it would be premature to conclude that there are no significant adverse effects on European sites.

- The potential for physical damage to sites and supporting habitats caused by the Draft Core Strategy is an issue where bats are the qualifying feature and while it is not addressed in the thematic policies it is considered in relevant Community Areas. It is also understood that additional guidance will be provided by the Council in a Supplementary Planning Document on this issue. It can therefore be concluded that the Core Strategy will not give rise to significant adverse effects on European sites’.

1.4.14 The key issues from these conclusions that need to be resolved through Core Strategy policies relate to the following:

- Policy relating to the provision of SANGS needs to be sharpened.

- Further consideration of issues concerning disturbance on all European sites not just Salisbury Plain and New Forest.

- Transport related emissions to air and point source pollution need further consideration in policy.

- Additional criterion is needed to Gypsy and Traveller policy relating to the avoidance of locations that might impact on European sites.

- Guidance to be published by the Council regarding impacts of development on bats.

1.4.15 Information regarding these conclusions has been included in this report in the relevant sections.

1.5 Structure of this report

1.5.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been designed to be as succinct as possible to improve accessibility of information and to allow key findings to be presented more concisely. Detailed appraisal work for Core Strategy policies and strategic sites are presented in separate appendices.

1.5.2 This first section has provided an introduction to sustainability appraisal, the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The rest of the report is structured as follows:
• **Section 2** – the methodology of how this appraisal was carried out, any limitations and consultation requirements.

• **Section 3** – an overview of the scoping stage, completed in April 2010, and the sustainability appraisal framework.

• **Section 4** – a summary of the main findings of the sustainability appraisal of the ‘Wiltshire 2026’ document from October 2009.

• **Section 5** – a summary of the main findings of the sustainability appraisal of the Wiltshire Core Strategy core policies, including options assessed, significant effects, mitigation measures and preferred options.

• **Section 6** – an overview of significant effects, recommended policy options to be taken forward, potential mitigation measures and the overall sustainability of the Core Strategy.

• **Section 7** – the Sustainability Appraisal Report must include proposals for future monitoring of predicted significant effects once the Core Strategy is implemented – this section briefly describes those proposals.

• **Section 8** – Next steps in the sustainability appraisal process.

1.5.3 This Sustainability Appraisal Report includes the required elements of an environmental report as required by the SEA Regulations.
2 Methodology

2.1 Approach adopted in carrying out the sustainability appraisal

2.1.1 The methodology for this appraisal was developed in accordance with the following guidance:

- Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Sustainability Appraisal guidance online at: http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=152450.

2.1.2 The guidance issued by PAS is the latest official guidance for sustainability appraisal and replaces the section relating to Development Plan Documents in the 2005 ODPM guidance. The latest guidance on SEA remains that issued by ODPM in 2005.

2.1.3 Wiltshire Council undertakes the entire sustainability appraisal process in-house within their spatial planning team. This work is supported by a Sustainability Working Group, made up of officers representing a range of disciplines from across the council. This group provides a forum to discuss the Wiltshire Core Strategy (and other planning documents) and associated Sustainability Appraisal.

2.2 Sustainability appraisal stages

2.2.1 The sustainability appraisal is carried out in a series of stages, which include setting the context and objectives for the sustainability appraisal, developing and assessing the effects of policy options and carrying out consultation on a Sustainability Appraisal Report. The stages of preparation are shown below in Table 1:

| Table 1: Stages of sustainability appraisal preparation |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Preparation stage | Description |
| A – Setting the context and objectives for the sustainability appraisal | This stage sets the scope for the ongoing appraisal by establishing an evidence base. A separate ‘Scoping Report’ has been completed and published for consultation. |
| B – Developing options and assessing effects | The sustainability appraisal is involved in developing policy options from the outset. Development and appraisal of options is an iterative process, with effects being predicted and evaluated for their significance. Potential mitigation measures for any predicted significant effects are considered at this stage. |
| C – Preparing a Sustainability Appraisal Report | This report is a key output of the appraisal process, presenting information on the effects of the plan in a format suitable for public consultation |
| D – Consulting on the plan and Sustainability Appraisal Report | The Sustainability Appraisal Report is published for consultation alongside the plan concerned. Consultation must include the statutory environmental consultation bodies. |
2.2.2 A Scoping Report, meeting the requirements of Stage A, was published in April 2010. This culminated in the production of a sustainability appraisal framework or set of sustainability objectives. This framework provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, analysed and compared, and forms the basis of the appraisal of Core Strategy effects.

2.2.3 More detail is provided on this scoping stage in section 3 of this report and the framework of sustainability objectives is presented in Appendix B.

2.3 Developing and refining policies and ‘reasonable alternatives’

2.3.1 The SEA Directive requires assessment of the likely significant effects of implementing the plan, and “reasonable alternatives”. Developing options and alternatives is an important part of both the plan-making and sustainability appraisal process. For development plan documents such as the Core Strategy, the reasonable alternatives are the different options put forward during the preparation of the plan.

2.3.2 Given the duty on authorities preparing Core Strategies to contribute to sustainable development, and as part of the broader principle of frontloading, Wiltshire Council began developing options from the start of the Core Strategy preparation process. The sustainability appraisal has been involved from an early stage in this development of options to help ensure that any adverse effects of proposals were identified as early as possible. Working with the public and stakeholders, including local strategic partners and the SEA consultation bodies has a major role in identifying and refining options. It can also help to ensure that options that could be considered ‘reasonable alternatives’ are satisfactorily defined and covered in the sustainability appraisal.

2.3.3 The first iteration of the Core Strategy in October 2009, ‘Wiltshire 2026’, considered strategic housing sites for towns across Wiltshire. The sustainability appraisal assessed up to four different strategic options for each town, helping to decide on a ‘preferred option’ for each town. A summary of this options appraisal work from October 2009 is presented in section 4 of this report.

2.3.4 For this current stage of the Core Strategy, a number of topic groups were established to develop policies and policy options/alternatives. This work has been published alongside the Core Strategy as a series of topic papers. The sustainability appraisal had involvement with these topic groups and advised on the relative sustainability of different options.

2.3.5 A number of additional strategic development sites have also been considered for a number of towns in Wiltshire, and these have undergone additional assessment to supplement the work undertaken previously.
2.3.6 In this report, for each policy area being considered, it is clearly indicated which option or options are more favourable in sustainability terms, and recommendations are made as to which options should be taken forward. These recommendations have clear links to the appraisal work undertaken, and potential amendments to policy options are suggested.

2.3.7 It is important to understand that sustainability appraisal helps to identify the most sustainable options overall. However, the 2005 guidance published by ODPM (see 2.1.1) states “it is not the role of the SA to determine the option(s) to be chosen as the basis for the preferred options and the draft plan. This is the role of those who have to decide which strategy is appropriate…the role of the SA is to assist with the identification of appropriate options…”

2.3.8 A summary of the main findings of the appraisal of options is presented in section 5, with detailed matrices presented in Appendices F and G, depending on the type of policy.

2.4 Assessing the significance of effects

2.4.1 The SEA Directive requires an assessment of “likely significant effects…taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme”. It is, therefore, only necessary to assess those effects that are likely to be significant, not all possible effects.

2.4.2 In this report, the social, environmental and economic effects of all Core Strategy policies have been predicted and evaluated for their significance. The sustainability appraisal framework, presented in Appendix B, forms the basis for the assessment throughout the report.

2.4.3 Prediction of effects involves identifying what changes might occur to the sustainability baseline over time – these changes are then evaluated for their likely significance, in terms of their probability, duration, frequency, geographical area and size of population likely to be affected. The value and vulnerability of certain areas and populations also affects the evaluation.

2.4.4 Assessment matrices (contained in appendices) present the detailed findings. Each matrix is relatively simple and allows for a discussion of potential effects, evidence and possible mitigation measures. The simplicity of the matrix is designed to reflect the fact that strategic options should (and in many cases can only be) assessed in broad terms due a lack of spatial expression. A combination of expert judgement and analysis of baseline data has been used to judge the effects.

2.4.5 Within each matrix, a significance ‘score’ – ranging from ++ (significant positive) to -- (significant negative) is given against each objective, based on the following criteria:
### Table 2: Effects assessment - general criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>Option would have a significant positive effect in its current form as it would help resolve an existing issue or maximise opportunities, leading to significant benefits. <strong>SIGNIFICANT POSITIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Option would have a positive effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Effect of option is uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Option would have a neutral effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Option would have a negative effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>The option would have a significant negative effect as it would substantially exacerbate existing problems with mitigation problematic. Exclusion of the option should be considered. <strong>SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: assessment of some objectives for a given option may be considered to be positive or negative but with some uncertainties, in which case a symbol such as +/? or -/? may be used.

### 2.4.6 Effects evaluation

Effects evaluation is then considered using more detailed criteria for each sustainability objective (see Appendix C). For example, the criteria used to assess policies against the sustainability objective relating to biodiversity are as follows:

### Table 3: Effects assessment – detailed criteria

#### Sustainability objective 1: **protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses**

| **++** SIGNIFICANT POSITIVE EFFECT | • No adverse effects on biodiversity or geological features  
• Policy/option will have significant positive effects on existing biodiversity or geological features  
• Protection of the natural environment is strongly promoted and the policy/option will offer significant opportunities for habitat restoration, enhancement or creation |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| +                                 | • No adverse effects on biodiversity or geological features  
• Policy/option will have positive effects on existing biodiversity or geological features  
• There may be further opportunities to maximise beneficial effects through habitat restoration, enhancement or creation |
| ?                                 | • Effects are uncertain and further information is required to establish potential effects |
| 0                                 | • Policy/option will have a neutral effect |
| -                                 | • Limited adverse effects on biodiversity or geological features  
• Limited mitigation proposed or there is potential for mitigation |
| **--** SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE EFFECT | • Policy/option will have significant adverse effects on a designated site or sites  
• **AND/OR** will have significant adverse effects on protected or notable species  
• **AND/OR** will lead to the loss or significant damage to ancient woodland  
• No mitigation, or inadequate mitigation measures proposed **OR** mitigation considered unachievable |
2.4.7 However, it is important to note that whilst criteria such as this can help in forming a judgement, significance has to be determined individually in each case i.e. effects which are significant in one situation are not necessarily significant in another. Flexibility is important and the criteria are used as a guideline.

2.4.8 Further discussion of policies will focus on effects considered ‘significant’. Ultimately, the significance of an effect is a matter of judgment, making best use of available evidence, and requires no more than a clear and reasonable justification. Where uncertainties exist or where it is considered that insufficient information exists to enable an accurate assessment to be made this will be noted.

Assessing cumulative effects

2.4.9 The assessment of effects of Core Strategy policies will include potential secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, as required by the SEA Directive. Many sustainability problems result from the accumulation of multiple, small and often indirect effects rather than a few large obvious ones, and consideration of such effects will be included in any further discussion of significant effects in this report.

2.4.10 An overview of the likely main cumulative effects of the Core Strategy is presented in section 6.

2.5 Consideration of potential mitigation measures

2.5.1 The SEA Directive requires consideration of “measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme”. These are referred to as mitigation measures, and can include recommendations for improving beneficial effects.

2.5.2 In the assessment matrices, potential mitigation measures are considered for likely adverse and positive effects. For any effects judged likely to be significant, these are discussed further in this report.

2.6 Appraisal limitations, difficulties encountered and assumptions made

2.6.1 A key issue in undertaking the appraisal of the Core Strategy is the strategic nature of the document and the uncertainty surrounding precisely how its ambitions would be implemented on the ground and the degree to which they would be achieved in practice (particularly since many different partners are involved in its delivery). A key assumption was made that the policies in the Core Strategy would be fully implemented (i.e. they were taken at ‘face value’).

2.6.2 One major issue encountered was the level of resources available to carry out the sustainability appraisal, particularly in the weeks leading up to the beginning of the consultation period. There have been up to 15 officers working on policy and Core Strategy development and the resources available to carry out the sustainability appraisal meant that only a very limited amount of time could be spent on each policy
area. This has meant that there has been a focus on outlining significant effects and mitigation measures rather than making detailed recommendations about policy wording. It is intended that further appraisal of ‘preferred’ policies will be carried out over the next few months prior to the ‘submission’ stage of the Core Strategy.

2.6.3 In terms of the prediction and evaluation of significant effects, the Core Strategy defines strategic areas for development, and it is possible to predict effects that may be likely in those areas through, for example, examining proximity to sensitive environmental receptors such as wildlife sites and watercourses. However, actual effects will depend on the type of development that takes place, the sustainability of buildings i.e. materials used, energy efficiency etc., location, design etc. The extent of any mitigation measures to prevent or reduce any effects or compensatory measures for loss will also be very important and cannot fully be assessed at this stage.

2.6.4 A Strategic Site Allocations DPD is planned for the coming months – this will be more site specific and will be subject to sustainability appraisal, allowing a more detailed appraisal of effects to be made.

2.6.5 Some gaps in the baseline data regarding detailed trends across the local authority area have been identified. Although every effort has been made to present an accurate baseline situation in the scoping report, there have been inevitable data constraints and the scoping report is subject to regular review. Information contained within the scoping report is always likely to become outdated quickly and there are time and resource issues regarding how often this data can be updated.

2.6.6 Inevitably, a high degree of judgement has been required in undertaking the policy appraisals to determine the ‘significance’ of effects. Sustainability appraisal relies on expert judgement, which is guided by knowledge of the likely impacts of the plan, the baseline data available and responses and information provided by consultees and other stakeholders. The assessment has been carried out and reported using an expert, judgement-led qualitative assessment. A ‘precautionary approach’ has been taken, especially with qualitative judgements and mitigation is suggested if there is any doubt as to the effect of the plan.

2.6.7 Assessing policies on a strategic scale with such wide-ranging implications has made it difficult to apply thresholds for when an effect of a policy is likely to be ‘significant’. Nevertheless, the sustainability appraisal has proved to be a useful tool in raising awareness of potential effects to inform the content of the Core Strategy.

2.7 Consultation requirements for the sustainability appraisal

The SEA Directive requires that…
“authorities with relevant environmental responsibilities and the public…shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan…and accompanying environmental report…”
2.7.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been published for formal public consultation alongside the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The consultation includes the statutory environmental organisations Natural England, English Heritage and Environment Agency, as required by the SEA Directive and a wide range of other stakeholders and community organisations.

2.7.2 It is recommended that public and stakeholder involvement on the sustainability appraisal is carried out at each stage in the development of the Core Strategy, in order to ensure that policies meet the objectives of sustainable development. A Sustainability Appraisal Report was published alongside the ‘Wiltshire 2026’ document and consulted on from October to December 2009.

2.7.3 Consultation has also previously been undertaken on the scope and level of detail of the sustainability appraisal (Scoping Report) from January to February 2009 and the results taken into account in a revised version published in April 2010. Seeking the views of the statutory environmental organisations on the scope and level of detail to be included in the Environmental Report is also a requirement of the SEA Directive.
3 Sustainability Appraisal context and objectives (scoping)

3.1 Introduction

The SEA Directive requires an environmental report to include...

“An outline of the plan’s relationship with other relevant plans and programmes”

“The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme”

“The environmental characteristics of those areas likely to be significantly affected”

“Any existing problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance such as areas designated pursuant to Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds and Habitats Directive”.

“The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation”

3.1.1 This stage of the sustainability appraisal (shown as stage A in Table 1) involves compiling background information needed before a sustainability appraisal can be undertaken. It established an evidence base for ongoing appraisal work and culminated in a framework of sustainability objectives.

3.1.2 Key tasks in this evidence compilation included:

- identifying relevant policies, plans and programmes
- collecting baseline information
- identifying key sustainability issues in Wiltshire
- establishing sustainability objectives.

3.1.3 This evidence base work was published by Wiltshire Council in a Scoping Report in April 2010 after a comprehensive and wide ranging public consultation exercise. The Scoping Report forms part of the environmental report required by the SEA Directive. The scoping work is subject to continual review as evidence becomes outdated and new information made available. In particular, the scoping report will be reviewed and updated prior to the submission version of the Core Strategy being published, to ensure that effects prediction and evaluation remains accurate and consistent.

3.1.4 In section 3.4, trend information reported in the Scoping Report has been used to identify the “future baseline” - the potential evolution of the baseline in the absence of the plan, as required by the SEA Directive. This prediction is based on current and past trends and would be subject to many external factors that the local authority cannot control, such as government policy and global issues such as climate change.
3.1.5 The key elements of the Scoping Report are described below, and the full version, including separate topic papers, can be viewed online at:
http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/ldfsustainabilityappraisal.htm

3.2 Relationship with other plans and programmes (policy context) and baseline evidence

3.2.1 A thorough review was undertaken of other relevant plans, policies and programmes and this was presented in the Scoping Report. The purpose of this was to meet the requirement of the SEA Directive to take account of environmental protection objectives and to gather other information that would influence options to be considered in plan preparation. This review not only included documents that would be relevant to the Core Strategy but to future Local Development Documents produced within the Local Development Framework (LDF).

3.2.2 This review studied a range of international, national, regional and local documents that should be taken into account during the preparation of plans within the LDF, under the following sustainability themes:

- Biodiversity and geodiversity
- Land and soil resources
- Water resources and flood risk
- Air quality and environmental pollution
- Climatic factors
- Historic environment
- Landscapes
- Population and housing
- Healthy communities
- Inclusive communities
- Education and skills
- Transport
- Economy and enterprise

3.2.3 This was followed by a thorough review of the sustainability ‘baseline’ in Wiltshire, organised under the above themes. Baseline identifies what is currently happening in Wiltshire and the likely future state of the area if current trends were to continue. It provides the basis for predicting and monitoring effects and helps to identify sustainability problems and alternative ways of dealing with them.

3.2.4 The baseline review consists of both qualitative and quantitative information, including an analysis of indicators which show trends on whether the situation is getting better or worse. This information is published in 13 topic papers which are available to view or download at the website shown in paragraph 3.1.3.

3.3 Key sustainability issues in Wiltshire

3.3.1 The review of plans, policies and programmes, and research of baseline, as described earlier, has enabled the identification of key sustainability issues in Wiltshire (including environmental problems as required by the SEA Directive). Sustainability issues can be any problems or uncertainties which need to be understood and addressed before the Core Strategy can be confidently considered sustainable.
3.3.2 Identifying sustainability issues is important when reaching an informed view on the sustainability of the Core Strategy. Key issues for Wiltshire have also been identified through awareness of existing problems and concerns in the area, and through consultation with stakeholders.

3.3.3 Sustainability issues are presented in Appendix D. On the basis of the issues identified, sustainability appraisal objectives have been defined which are used to test how likely the proposals in the Core Strategy and alternative options are to lead to sustainable outcomes. These are discussed in section 3.5.

3.4 Likely evolution of the area without implementation of the Core Strategy

3.4.1 The SEA Directive requires that the environmental report includes a discussion of “the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme”. Much of the baseline information collected during the scoping stage records the state of the situation in Wiltshire at a point or points in time. However, the topic papers also include analysis of trends over several years, and this enables us to think about how Wiltshire might evolve if no Core Strategy was implemented.

3.4.2 This section will give a brief outline of the potential evolution of the area without implementation of the Core Strategy, based on the 13 topic areas presented in 3.2.2. It is important to note that this is a theoretical exercise, but is based on known trends and sustainability issues already occurring. The actual future situation will depend on many external factors that are outside the control of the local authority, such as government policy, plans of neighbouring authorities, climatic factors etc.

Biodiversity

3.4.3 Biodiversity in Wiltshire continues to be threatened by many activities, including habitat loss and fragmentation, agriculture, housing development, road building, water pollution, air pollution and climate change. The Core Strategy is likely to adversely affect existing biodiversity assets through promoting development, especially on greenfield land. However, it also contains a wide range of policies concerned with protecting and enhancing the natural environment, and policies promoting Green Infrastructure (GI) are one example of this.

3.4.4 Without implementation of the Core Strategy, we will be relying on existing saved policies that are possibly weaker and less coordinated that do not give such a strong steer towards protection and enhancement of the natural environment. There is no current saved policy on GI which will provide a strategically planned network of multi-functional green spaces across Wiltshire.

3.4.5 Development proposals will still come forward if there was no Core Strategy, but possibly in less sustainable locations that may directly lead to increased loss of biodiversity or may not provide the mitigation and enhancement measures that would be needed.
3.4.6 In terms of potential effects of climate change on biodiversity, whether we have a Core Strategy or not is unlikely to be significant as climate change is a global issue. Our effects on the climate are most likely to arise from human activity, especially energy use and transport resulting from existing and future population. Any future changes in the climate are likely to have both positive and negative effects on biodiversity, with some species benefitting and others adversely affected.

Land and soil resources

3.4.7 In Wiltshire, there is a limited amount of brownfield land to develop and in the future, an increasing amount of greenfield land is likely to be needed for housing and employment growth. The Core Strategy promotes development of Wiltshire’s remaining brownfield sites, particularly in town centres. These sites, which will often require significant remediation, may not be developed as quickly, or at all, without the pro-active approach of the Core Strategy. There is also likely to be less emphasis on high density development in sustainable locations, such as town centres, that can benefit from good public transport links and proximity to local services and facilities.

3.4.8 Policies regarding waste are contained within other DPDs and recycling rates continue to increase, however the amount of waste also increases with an increasing population. The need for waste infrastructure has been assessed through the Core Strategy, particularly to meet the demands of new housing, and without Core Strategy implementation the necessary waste infrastructure may not be in place to deal with future population growth.

Water resources and flood risk

3.4.9 Water demand is increasing, and climate change may further increase this demand. The Core Strategy considers provision of necessary water infrastructure to cope with anticipated population growth. Without the Core Strategy, this infrastructure may not be adequate to cope with future water scarcity issues. However, with the expected improvements to Building Regulations, the water efficiency of new dwellings is likely to improve over the next 5 years.

3.4.10 Risk of flooding is likely to be greater if development takes place in unsuitable locations. The Core Strategy is promoting strategic sites for development which have been subject to sustainability appraisal, where flood risk has been assessed and these sites are thought to be the most sustainable locations.

Air quality and environmental pollution

3.4.11 In Wiltshire, issues regarding declining air quality are often linked with traffic increases and congestion, particularly in town centres with a number of designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Air quality is likely to continue to decline in some areas without policies that promote development of sustainable transport links and that promote housing development in sustainable locations that reduce the need to travel.
3.4.12 Issues such as noise and light pollution (including tranquillity concerns) and other forms of pollution are largely caused by urban development. The amount of development may not necessarily be any greater without Core Strategy implementation, but development pressure is more likely to take place in less sustainable locations, leading to increases in environmental pollution.

Climatic factors

3.4.13 Wiltshire’s contribution towards greenhouse gas emissions is most likely to come mainly from energy use in the home and transport. The Core Strategy promotes levels of energy efficiency in line with national policy, provision of sustainable transport modes, residential development in locations that reduces the need to travel and promotes renewable energy and other forms of low/zero carbon energy generation. Our impacts on climate change are likely to be higher without these policies.

3.4.14 Reliance on existing local plan policies is also likely to leave us more exposed to the effects of climate change, such as water shortages and flood risk. Core Strategy policies concerning infrastructure provision, promotion of sustainable drainage systems and GI will increase our ability to adapt to future, unpredictable climate effects.

Historic environment

3.4.15 In the absence of the Core Strategy, protection of the historic environment could be assumed to remain as it is now. Core Strategy policy possibly provides increased protection and enhancement of the historic environment and will replace a number of policies of the former district councils, giving greater clarification through one Wiltshire-wide policy.

3.4.16 We cannot be certain whether levels of development and growth would be higher or lower without Core Strategy implementation. Housing requirements for Wiltshire are now lower than the RSS requirement. Without an up-to-date plan in place, development is likely to come forward in less sustainable locations that could damage designated sites or buildings and their setting.

Landscapes

3.4.17 In the future, landscape character may be threatened by lack of appropriate management, inappropriate development in unsustainable locations and climate change if stronger policies are not adopted through the Core Strategy. Without the Core Strategy, areas deemed to be of poor townscape character may not be pro-actively improved, leading to degradation in townscape quality.

3.4.18 Wiltshire has a relatively high percentage of land covered by national and local landscape designations that currently receive a high degree of protection. It is unclear whether Core Strategy policies will strengthen this protection. The main threat to Wiltshire’s landscapes is arguably from urban development and the Core
Strategy will ensure that strategic housing and employment sites are identified in sustainable locations, and that relevant mitigation and enhancement measures have been incorporated.

**Population and housing**

3.4.19 A review has been undertaken of Wiltshire’s housing requirements to 2026 – this has looked at past trends and includes the needs of existing residents, potential future levels of in-migration and the needs of the local economy.

3.4.20 Without the pro-active planning represented by Core Strategy policy, it may be difficult to meet future housing need and affordable housing need in particular. Affordability is a particular problem in Wiltshire as it is an attractive area to live in with a high quality environment. Delivery of adequate levels of affordable housing is not likely to result through existing saved policies.

**Healthy communities**

3.4.21 Development of the Core Strategy has included research into future infrastructure requirements to meet the needs of housing and employment growth and a growing population. This includes provision of health and social care provision, green infrastructure, recreational, sports and leisure facilities and the need for open space provision. Water, waste, transport and energy infrastructure are also key requirements. These are all key components of healthy communities and the Core Strategy has brought this research forward into one policy, providing an overarching policy for decision-makers, developers and infrastructure providers. This is likely to provide greater certainty and achieve higher levels of infrastructure than existing saved policies.

3.4.22 Wiltshire faces a number of pressures in the future, including an ageing population, increasing levels of obesity and rising fuel prices than will increase levels of fuel poverty. The Core Strategy addresses all these issues through consideration of appropriate infrastructure that can improve health and wellbeing, allowing more people to lead healthy lifestyles.

**Inclusive communities**

3.4.23 A reliance on existing saved policies is unlikely to achieve greater benefits for social inclusion and reducing poverty and deprivation. Planning can play an important role in reducing social exclusion through locating developments in areas that have good access to a range of services and facilities, ensuring that there are good sustainable transport links, especially to/from town centres, and by ensuring that development contributes in terms of providing the range of services and facilities that people need.

3.4.24 The Core Strategy will indirectly influence household income, employment levels and social inclusion through allocating land for housing and employment uses and being proactive in helping local businesses to expand and other businesses to locate in
Wiltshire. This is the main way the Core Strategy can influence levels of poverty and deprivation.

**Education and skills**

3.4.25 Without updated and revised policy through the Core Strategy and associated research into employment land demand, future need for land is unlikely to be met for local businesses and those businesses wanting to move to the area. This will have a detrimental impact on employment and subsequent skills levels and training/apprenticeship opportunities.

3.4.26 Future housing growth in Wiltshire may not provide necessary developer contributions towards educational provision if relying on current policies that are inconsistent, and in some cases non-existent, across the former district council areas.

**Transport**

3.4.27 It is likely that current trends of increasing car use, particularly to and from work, and levels of out-commuting will continue and increase without implementation of the Core Strategy. This may reduce the availability and viability of public transport services throughout Wiltshire, therefore helping to increase traffic on the highway network, resulting in pressure to build new roads.

3.4.28 Promotion of sustainable transport – including walking, cycling and public transport – which the Core Strategy does alongside the Local Transport Plan, will help reduce the pressures on Wiltshire’s roads and may bring forward alternative and more attractive schemes that will allow people a real choice.

3.4.29 The need to travel is influenced strongly by the location of housing and jobs and proximity of local services and facilities. Regeneration of town centres and building at higher densities in sustainable locations can all help the viability of public transport and allow investment in walking and cycling routes.

**Economy and enterprise**

3.4.30 Maintaining a buoyant local economy will rely on providing an adequate amount of additional employment land to meet future need and protecting and enhancing existing employment areas. Existing saved policies are variable and inconsistent across the former district council areas and relying on these is unlikely to provide for future demand from current businesses and will not attract inward investment that is needed to reduce out-commuting.

3.4.31 The Core Strategy promotes regeneration in a number of town centres which will improve the employment offer in these areas and help increase footfall thereby increasing the viability of town centre businesses.
3.5 **Sustainability appraisal framework**

3.5.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework consists of sustainability objectives which provide a way in which the effects of the Core Strategy can be described, analysed and compared. These objectives were developed as a result of the review of other plans and programmes and baseline, consultation responses and from the identified sustainability issues, in particular.

3.5.2 Sustainability appraisal objectives are different in concept and purpose from the objectives of the Core Strategy, though there is a degree of overlap. They are not necessarily intended to be achievable, but are more aspirational in nature, and address the full cross-section of sustainability issues, including social, economic and environmental factors laid down by law or policy.

3.5.3 The objectives are listed in the following table and these form the basis of the appraisal. The full framework is presented in Appendix B, which includes more detailed ‘decision aiding criteria’; the ‘decision aiding criteria’ help to ensure that all the key issues are included in the framework.

### Table 4: Sustainability themes and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability theme</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>1. Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Promote sustainable waste management solutions that encourage the reduction, re-use and recycling of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Soil Resources</td>
<td>4. Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Protect people and property from the risk of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources and Flood Risk</td>
<td>6. Improve air quality throughout Wiltshire and minimise all sources of environmental pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality and Environmental Pollution</td>
<td>7. Minimise our impacts on climate change and reduce our vulnerability to future climate change effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic Factors</td>
<td>8. Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment and archaeological assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment</td>
<td>9. Protect and enhance the character and quality of Wiltshire’s rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Summary of ‘Wiltshire 2026’ Sustainability Appraisal findings

4.1 What is ‘Wiltshire 2026’?

4.1.1 ‘Wiltshire 2026 – Planning for Wiltshire’s future’ formed an important, initial stage in the development of the Core Strategy. It brought together all the work carried out by the former district councils in Wiltshire (except Salisbury District Council) and presented an overall vision and strategy for development in Wiltshire for the period to 2026.

4.1.2 Wiltshire 2026 invited comments on three key areas; a vision and strategic objectives for Wiltshire; preferred strategic site allocations, and a spatial strategy for Wiltshire. Strategic policy options were not included at that stage, but are included in the latest iteration of the Core Strategy that is the subject of this current Sustainability Appraisal Report. These policies will help to deliver the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy, and the appraisal is summarised in section 5.

4.1.3 A Sustainability Appraisal Report was produced and published alongside Wiltshire 2026 in October 2009, presenting an appraisal of the vision and objectives, spatial strategy and strategic sites. A summary of the main findings follows in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and housing</th>
<th>10. Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy communities</td>
<td>11. Provide a safe and healthy environment in which to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Communities</td>
<td>12. Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive and self-contained communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Improve equality of access to, and engagement in local, high-quality community services and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and skills</td>
<td>14. Raise educational attainment levels across the authority and provide opportunities for people to improve their workplace skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>15. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and enterprise</td>
<td>16. Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Ensure adequate provision of high-quality employment land and diverse employment opportunities to meet the needs of local businesses and a changing workforce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Vision and objectives

4.2.1 The Wiltshire 2026 vision has regard to the issues and challenges facing Wiltshire and leads to the identification of objectives which will deliver this vision. The objectives set out what the Core Strategy is aiming to achieve in spatial planning terms and set the context for the development of policy options.

4.2.2 It is important for these objectives to be in accordance with sustainability principles, and therefore they were tested for compatibility with the sustainability appraisal objectives. This helped in refining the Core Strategy objectives as well as in identifying policy options.

4.2.3 The sustainability appraisal found that, overall, the Core Strategy vision and objectives score well against the sustainability appraisal objectives and that they are reasonably well balanced between social, economic and environmental themes, and cover the full range of sustainability objectives.

4.2.4 A number of uncertainties were noted, in particular:

- the compatibility of Core Strategy objective 1 to address climate change with sustainability objective 16 to encourage a vibrant and diversified economy
- the compatibility of Core Strategy objective 6 to meet Wiltshire's housing needs with sustainability objective 2 that promotes use of previously developed land
- the compatibility of Core Strategy objectives relating to economic growth, town centre vitality and promoting tourism with sustainability objective 15 that seeks to reduce the need to travel.

4.2.5 It is to be expected that there will be some incompatibility between Core Strategy objectives and sustainability objectives, as there is incompatibility between some of the sustainability objectives themselves. These areas of uncertainty often relate to the promotion of housing and economic growth and consequent effects on the natural and built environment. Many of these effects can be effectively mitigated or reduced, in practice, and this is where sustainability appraisal can greatly benefit the development of policy. Objectives will be delivered through policies and the likely effects of these policies will be assessed later in this report.

4.2.6 The assessment of the vision and strategic objectives together against sustainability objectives found that most effects would be either minor or uncertain. Significant positive outcomes were reported for housing provision, economic growth and for employment.

4.2.7 Uncertain effects were reported for air quality and environmental pollution, landscape and transport. Numbers of new homes and jobs proposed would be likely to have some adverse effects on landscapes, and it could be expected that private car use
would increase with possible effects on local air quality. However, effects will depend on numbers of new homes, location, sustainability of design and efforts to minimise the effects of private car use through sustainable transport modes.

4.2.8 Any amendments that have been made to the Core Strategy vision and objectives since Wiltshire 2026 was published in 2009 will be assessed in section 5.2 of this report.

4.3 Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy

4.3.1 The sustainability appraisal of ‘Wiltshire 2026’ in 2009 carried out an assessment of the spatial strategy, which incorporated a settlement hierarchy for Wiltshire. The Spatial Strategy background paper described both a settlement hierarchy and an overall distribution of housing across north, west and east Wiltshire which was based on an assessment of need and on an analysis of the role and function of each settlement.

4.3.2 Work on the spatial strategy was based on the issues and options stage of the plan preparation process conducted by the former district councils in Wiltshire during 2007 and 2008. It was considered important to assess the options of the former districts as these had been developed independently and subject to different sets of sustainability objectives.

4.3.3 The figures within the spatial strategy also met the requirements for new homes and employment within the South West Regional Spatial Strategy. However, Wiltshire Council has now carried out a review of overall housing requirements within the authority area for the plan period 2006-2026, since the new coalition government announced its intention to abolish regional strategies. It is the intention that Wiltshire’s housing requirements should be identified within the context of the current ‘localism agenda’, and Wiltshire Council have reappraised housing need to identify locally derived requirements in accordance with this agenda.

4.3.4 This review of housing requirements has undergone a separate sustainability appraisal and the findings are outlined in section 5 of this report.

4.3.5 A summary of the sustainability appraisal findings of the former district council options for growth is given below:

Assessment of spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy – East Wiltshire

4.3.6 Option 1 - the sustainability appraisal considered that the main towns of Devizes, Marlborough and Tidworth/Ludgershall would all benefit from some moderate levels of new housing, and that options that considered development only in Devizes or only in Devizes and Tidworth/Ludgershall would not be appropriate.

4.3.7 The issue of traffic congestion in Devizes was raised and it was considered that this was likely to be exacerbated if significant growth was directed towards the settlement. However, it was noted that some growth could help facilitate the delivery
of road and other transport improvements to reduce this effect. Significant growth in Devizes may also benefit the town through improved provision of infrastructure and facilities, derived through developer contributions. However, this would be at the expense of the other main towns if growth was exclusively concentrated on Devizes.

4.3.8 It was noted that Marlborough is relatively constrained and has limited opportunities for development, although some growth is required to maintain the vitality of the town centre and ensure the sustainability of the community. It was also considered that directing growth to Tidworth/Ludgershall is demonstrated to help build a more balanced community and that greater housing provision will enable additional infrastructure development.

4.3.9 Option 2 – the appraisal concluded that distribution of small scale growth between villages in the district would be better if it was concentrated in two villages – Pewsey and Market Lavington. However, it was noted that some small scale growth across various villages would help improve the range of housing, especially affordable housing, and make some local businesses eg village stores, more viable.

4.3.10 Transport impacts of growth were noted, in particular, with likely increases in private transport use if growth was distributed to a range of smaller villages. Although some small villages have a good range of facilities, the scale of provision will always be lower than for larger settlements. Focussing small scale growth to Pewsey and Market Lavington, rather than a number of other smaller villages would therefore be more sustainable from a transport perspective.

4.3.11 Although directing growth to a range of small villages would create likely negative effects associated with transport, new housing, including affordable houses, healthcare and community facilities directed to a wider range of communities would help to preserve the vitality of these settlements and therefore be regarded as more sustainable.

**Assessment of spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy – North Wiltshire**

4.3.12 The North Wilts Issues and Options paper in 2007 considered three options for the location of development, including the scale of development - these encompassed the distribution of development across both the main towns and larger villages. Options classified settlements as Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3, with Chippenham as the only Tier 1 settlement in each option.

4.3.13 As both Options 1 and 2 included growth across a wide range of larger villages it is likely that the scale of growth would be small in any single settlement. On this basis, any benefit derived from additional development towards providing additional services, is likely to be small. Distributing greater growth across a wider range of settlements, may also reduce the scale of growth required in the main towns, and therefore lessen the potential benefit for additional services and facilities that might be derived in those locations.
4.3.14 Focusing growth to the main towns and a much narrower range of larger villages is likely to ensure benefits and improved facilities are not only maximised, but are located in the most accessible places. Option 3 performs much more positively overall as development is focused on a combination of a wider range of market towns and a narrower range of larger villages. This should maximise community value and minimise the scale of growth being directed towards locations with poorer accessibility. Focusing development just on Chippenham and Calne would be at the expense of the provision of improved facilities within the other main settlements.

Assessment of spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy – West Wiltshire

4.3.15 The West Wiltshire Issues and Options paper in 2007 considered the spatial distribution of growth between the main towns and villages and the location of large employment sites in Trowbridge.

4.3.16 Options which focus development to a narrower range of larger villages are thought to be the most sustainable approach. It was assumed that growth directed towards villages would be at a small scale and this is likely to dilute the potential advantages that might be derived through provision of increased community facilities. Smaller scale growth across a wide range of villages is also likely to result in the largest increase in car usage. It was thought that directing growth to a smaller range of settlements will not only focus any potential benefits derived through the provision of additional facilities, but will help to ensure development occurs in the most sustainable locations.

4.3.17 Option 3 was considered the most sustainable approach overall, as it widens the range of larger settlements for the focus of growth, but narrows the range of smaller settlements to be the focus of growth.

4.3.18 With regards employment land in West Wiltshire, options considered the need being met through the delivery of one or two large sites in Trowbridge, a number of smaller sites or a combination of large sites in Trowbridge, and the remainder being met within well located sites in nearby towns.

4.3.19 Overall no likely significant negative or positive effects were recorded for any of the options considered and this may be due to the general nature of the options. It was thought the most sustainable option would be the one that allows for a combination of large employment sites located in Trowbridge and other provision across a range of other market towns. There is a need to provide additional employment opportunities across a range of towns, not just in Trowbridge. This will help to reduce the need for commuting between towns and help to maintain the vitality of those settlements.

4.4 Strategic sites

4.4.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy allocates strategic sites for housing and employment development. These sites vary in size, type and capacity, and include housing, housing and mixed use, employment and regeneration sites. Many of these sites
came from suggestions made by the community or stakeholders, such as sites promoted by landowners, and through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process.

4.4.2 In all, 14 settlements (including an area referred to as ‘West of Swindon’) were identified as suitable to have a strategic role, and between two and five options were identified for how the future housing growth could be delivered in each of these settlements. The identified sites were subject to a comprehensive assessment process to determine the suitability of these sites for delivering the required housing growth. The identification of settlements suitable for strategic growth was determined by the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy work.

4.4.3 All of these options were assessed through the sustainability appraisal, using the techniques described in Section 2 of this report. This helped identify a preferred strategic option to take forward for each settlement. The preferred options that came out of this appraisal are shown in the following table:

Table 5: Wiltshire 2026 preferred strategic sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Description of preferred option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>3650 dwellings, employment land and mixed use development located to the northeast and east of Chippenham and a town centre strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td>2650 dwellings and employment land south east of Trowbridge and a town centre strategic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford-on-Avon</td>
<td>150 dwellings and mixed use development on land at the Moulton Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calne</td>
<td>500 dwellings and mixed use development on four sites - Oxford Road, Penn Hill Farm, East Woodhill Rise, East of Calne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsham</td>
<td>100 dwellings on land to the west of Corsham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>700 dwellings on land north east of Devizes, north west of Devizes and south east of Devizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>200 dwellings on land north east of Malmesbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>250 dwellings land to the south of Marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melksham</td>
<td>400 dwellings and mixed use development on land east of Melksham and between Melksham and Bowerhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidworth/Ludgershall</td>
<td>1200 dwellings and mixed use development on land to the north-west of Ludgershall, south of Ludgershall and in the centre of Tidworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>900 dwellings and mixed use development on land north west and west of Warminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>300 dwellings on land at Matravers School and land at Redland Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wootton Bassett</td>
<td>150 dwellings to the south of Wootton Bassett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Swindon</td>
<td>No clear preference between Option 1 (land at Pry Farm, Ridgeway Farm and Moredon Bridge) and Option 3 (sites at Hook St and at either Washpool or land at Ridgeway Farm and Moredon Bridge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Since that sustainability appraisal was carried out and published in 2009, a review of the sites has been carried out to assess whether the sites are strategic. Additional alternative strategic site options have also been identified in Bradford on Avon and Warminster. In the case of Chippenham, a review of all options in and around the
town has been undertaken (details of which are presented in Section 5.7). Details of these additional sites are shown in the following table:

**Table 6: Additional strategic site options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Description of additional strategic site options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford-on-Avon</td>
<td>Land north of Holt road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>Land east of the Dene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>1a. Land North of Chippenham promoted by the North Chippenham Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Land north of Barrow farm and east of Birds Marsh Wood – promoted by Robert Hitchins Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Land East of Chippenham, land North of London Road and Stanley Lane, Abbeyfield School, Forest Gate Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Land at Forest Farm, south east of Chippenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Land south of Pewsham Way and land south of Pewsham, land opposite Showell Farm and land east of Lackham College and Showell Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Land at Patterdown and Rowden, The Paddock, land at Milbourne Farm, Showell Nurseries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Hunters Moon, land at Chippenham Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Land at West Chippenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Chippenham town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.5 The sustainability appraisal compared the findings of the assessment of the new option with that for the original preferred option, and recommended the following:

**Bradford-on-Avon** - the Moulton estate site performs better against the range of sustainability objectives and therefore should remain as the preferred strategic option for Bradford on Avon.

**Warminster** – land east of The Dene would make a suitable location for housing development but would not be large enough to accommodate all anticipated housing growth in Warminster. Some housing development could be delivered here in combination with housing to the west of Warminster.

**Chippenham** – the sustainability appraisal was not able to recommend one specific option. There are no absolute constraints to development at any of the options and other studies of Chippenham’s needs will ultimately feed into the decision making process. The town centre strategic option is likely to give the greatest benefits overall due to its location, but in terms of housing and employment provision, it is only likely to meet a fraction of future need in Chippenham.

The larger urban extension proposals, in the south and east, are very similar in their assessment scores. There are few specific environmental constraints to development in these areas, apart from the River Avon corridor, and both options could provide a wide range of infrastructure and community facilities. Smaller options are unlikely to result in the same level of environmental, social and economic benefits unless combined with the larger options. However, the smaller size of these sites could mean there are fewer environmental impacts than the larger options.
Further information regarding these sites is contained within the Core Strategy document and supporting background documents. The additional sustainability appraisal work is presented in Appendix G and summarised in the relevant section for that community area.

5 Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policies

5.1 Introduction

The SEA Directive requires an environmental report to include...

“the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives…”

“an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties… encountered in compiling the required information”

“the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme”.

5.1.1 Whereas Wiltshire 2026 focused on strategic sites for housing, the latest draft of the Core Strategy also contains a number of policies that relate to different themes – these are referred to as ‘core’ policies. A number of topic groups were set up during 2010/2011 to gather evidence and develop these different policies that will help meet the objectives of the Core Strategy.

5.1.2 With reference to the requirements of the SEA Directive outlined above, policy options/alternatives must be appraised and their likely significant effects “identified, described and evaluated”. This appraisal must include an explanation of why different options were selected and the possible measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effect. This is carried out as described in section 2 (methodology) and following the guidance documents outlined in that section.

5.1.3 In this section, a summary of the results of the appraisal of policy options is presented. For each policy area, details of the options being considered are given (further details of these options, and how they were developed, are presented in the Core Strategy and associated ‘topic papers’ published alongside the Core Strategy). Significant effects of options are described with details of possible mitigation measures, and finally a clear indication is given as to which option or options are more favourable in sustainability terms, with recommendations as to which options should be taken forward. These recommendations have clear links to the appraisal work undertaken.
5.1.4 It is important to reiterate here that sustainability appraisal helps to identify the most sustainable options overall. It is not the role of the sustainability appraisal to decide the options to be chosen as the basis for the preferred options and the Core Strategy – this is the role of those who have to decide which strategy is appropriate. The role of the sustainability appraisal is to assist with the identification of appropriate options by highlighting the sustainability implications of each and putting forward recommendations for improvement.

5.2 Core Strategy spatial vision and strategic objectives

5.2.1 The Core Strategy spatial vision and strategic objectives have already been subjected to sustainability appraisal as they were first introduced in the Wiltshire 2026 consultation document. The main findings have been summarised in section 4.2 of this report and that assessment is presented in Appendix E.

5.2.2 The spatial vision provides an overarchi ng direction for development within Wiltshire and this vision remains unchanged in the latest draft of the Core Strategy.

5.2.3 A number of the strategic objectives have been amended slightly taking into account the findings of the previous consultation and the sustainability appraisal, and these are shown in the following table:

Table 7 - Core Strategy strategic objectives amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Wiltshire 2026 strategic objectives</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Amended Draft Core Strategy 2011 strategic objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To address climate change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To addresses climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To provide for long term economic growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To deliver a thriving economy which provides a range of job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To meet Wiltshire’s housing needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>To provide everyone with access to a decent, affordable home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To secure appropriate infrastructure and services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>To ensure that essential infrastructure is in place to support our communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To enhance the vitality and viability of town centres</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>To enhance the vitality and viability of town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To encourage safe accessible places</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To help build resilient communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To promote sustainable forms of transport</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>To promote sustainable forms of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the natural environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To safeguard and promote a high quality built environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>To safeguard and promote a high quality built and historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To minimise the risk of flooding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To minimise the risk of flooding and effective water management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4 Minor amendments have been made to objectives relating to the economy, housing provision, infrastructure provision, communities and the built environment. It is not considered that these amendments significantly affect the previous assessment and further assessment is therefore not required.
Summary of assessment of Core Strategy spatial vision and strategic objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment score</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Core policy 1: The settlement hierarchy

5.3.1 Core policy 1 sets out the different tiers of the settlement hierarchy and defines the type of development that is appropriate at each tier. In this way, the settlement strategy seeks to deliver appropriate and sustainable development across all settlements in Wiltshire.

5.3.2 The settlement strategy has been developed based on an understanding of the role and function of the settlements across Wiltshire and how they interact with their immediate communities and their wider hinterland. The evidence which has informed this understanding of the role and function of settlements is set out in the Settlement Strategy Topic Paper.

5.3.3 The sustainability appraisal has considered options relating to i) the Settlement Strategy and ii) settlement boundaries. Details of these assessments are presented below.

Part 1: Settlement Strategy

5.3.4 The purpose of part 1 of this policy is to:

- understand what type of development is appropriate at which settlements and locations in Wiltshire
- identify which settlements are the most appropriate locations of strategic growth.

What options have been considered?

5.3.5 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only identify strategic settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify a full hierarchy of settlements and locations where development is not appropriate. A caveat will be added to allow settlements to change their role through other planning documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indentify strategic settlements and other settlements but do not define hierarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.6 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.3.7 Significant benefits are envisaged in terms of housing provision through Options 1 and 3. Option 1 provides certainty about locations for strategic growth in Wiltshire and will allow other settlements to choose the level of development they feel is appropriate. Option 3 also provides certainty about locations for strategic growth and other settlements, but does not identify areas where growth would be inappropriate.

5.3.8 A number of adverse effects have been predicted with all three options. However, the significance of many of these effects will depend on the location, type and size of any development proposed. It is difficult to assess further impacts without greater knowledge of a particular development.

5.3.9 Option 2, being more restrictive in nature, will not allow development in areas where it would be inappropriate. This means that there may be benefits for biodiversity and landscapes in those areas where development is not permitted, but there may be economic and social impacts such as reducing employment opportunities and affordable housing provision.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.3.10 No significant adverse effects have been predicted with the three policy options. However, a number of minor adverse effects are likely.

5.3.11 It is important that development is promoted in appropriate locations where adverse environmental effects are minimised. This means avoiding or reducing impacts on biodiversity, landscapes, water resources, air quality and the historic environment. Many small, rural communities are located in areas that are environmentally sensitive and they do not have the range of services and infrastructure to support growth.

5.3.12 Policy must not be so restrictive, however, that economic and social opportunities are severely limited. This would lead to increases in out-commuting and reduced viability for those important services and facilities that remain in rural areas.

5.3.13 Maintaining a hierarchy will protect certain areas from inappropriate development. However, it needs to be flexible enough to meet the needs and wishes of local communities if they agree that they need a different level of growth and can provide justification for this.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.3.14 Options 1 and 3 are the only options where significant benefits are considered likely. However, although they might both lead to increased development, with housing provision and employment opportunities across a wider range of communities, much of this development would take place in communities that do not have the necessary infrastructure to cope. There would be significant pressures on the natural environment and substantial development in rural locations would increase the need to travel. Therefore, Option 2 would be the preferable option.

5.3.15 It is considered that maintaining a settlement hierarchy would provide the protection that smaller communities require – removing a hierarchy does not provide certainty on smaller settlements role and function which could cause development pressure in rural locations and may lead to inappropriate development at unsuitable locations.

5.3.16 The recommended policy is one that allows enough flexibility so that communities can decide what level of growth they want if it can be justified and leads to a more sustainable community. This can only be achieved through greater community involvement and possibly production of neighbourhood plans.

Part 2: Settlement boundaries

5.3.17 The purpose of part 2 of this policy is to:

- define the best method in deciding about the location of development beyond strategic allocations.
What options have been considered?

5.3.18 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain existing settlement boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify new settlement boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Remove settlement boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.19 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives and a summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.3.20 Significant adverse effects are considered likely through Option 3. The removal of settlement boundaries could lead to a significant amount of inappropriate development as decisions on applications are made on a case by case basis. This may then lead to inappropriate urban sprawl/ribbon development or a series of smaller developments that together have a significant cumulative impact in settlements that do not have the infrastructure to cope with such development.

5.3.21 Through Option 3, a significant loss of Greenfield land and high value agricultural land may occur and significant landscape impacts. The extent of any impacts would depend on location, type and size of development.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.3.22 Settlement boundaries may need to be revised but removing them all together would lead to increased pressure to develop in inappropriate locations.
5.3.23 Any relaxation or amendment of boundaries should not lead to inappropriate development that would lead to loss of significant areas of Greenfield land or high value agricultural land. Development should also be located where adverse impacts on rural and urban landscapes can be avoided or minimised. Removing settlement boundaries is unlikely to achieve this.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.3.24 Option 2 is considered the most sustainable option. It will allow settlements to expand in an acceptable and agreed manner. Boundaries can be amended where it is necessary and where boundaries do not need amending they can be left as they are.

5.3.25 A limited amount of growth in a settlement can promote self-containment, reducing the need to travel and supporting local businesses. It can also provide much needed local employment and provide affordable housing to meet the needs of local families and young people who wish to remain in their community.

5.4 **Core policy 2: Delivery strategy**

5.4.1 The delivery strategy aims to strengthen communities by allowing appropriate growth which readdresses the imbalance between employment and housing. The underlying principle of the delivery strategy is to ensure that communities have a balance of services, jobs and homes.

5.4.2 The policy contains a number of different elements relating to:

- employment land provision
- overall housing provision in Wiltshire
- housing provision in principal settlements and community areas
- level of development on previously developed land
- affordable housing
- strategic sites.

5.4.3 Some of these elements are covered in other sections of this report:

- Affordable housing – under Core Policy 28
- Strategic sites – included within sections relating to each community area and in Appendix G (Housing sites) and Appendix H (Employment sites)

5.4.4 Sustainability appraisal work has been carried out on the proposed housing numbers for Wiltshire overall and on the amount of previously developed land required, and a summary of this work follows.
In relation to the proposed amounts of employment land for Wiltshire overall and for each community area, and proposed numbers of homes at principal settlements, market towns and community areas, further sustainability appraisal work is required on these proposed figures. This is due to the importance of consulting on the overall housing figures for Wiltshire.

The strategic distribution of housing between different housing market areas (to be defined) and at the community area level, will be assessed prior to the Core Strategy Submission Draft stage, taking account of comments received during the consultation period beginning June 2011.

**Wiltshire’s future housing requirements**

Wiltshire Council has undertaken a review of overall housing requirements within the authority area for the plan period 2006-2026. A Sustainability appraisal has been undertaken to inform this review, ensuring that sustainable development considerations are integrated from the outset. This work has informed the overall housing requirements in the Core Strategy.

The review of housing requirements was in response to the announcement by the Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) confirming the coalition government’s intention to abolish regional strategies. It is the intention that Wiltshire’s housing requirements should be identified within the context of the current ‘localism agenda’, and a decision was made to reappraise housing need and to identify locally derived requirements in accordance with this agenda.

Prior to the decision to revoke regional strategies, the overall scale and distribution of new housing across the south west region had been established in the (un-adopted) South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). This document included local authority housing targets and targets for specific settlements – known as Strategically Significant Cities or Towns (SSCTs) – which included the Wiltshire settlements of Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge. Throughout the preparation of the South West RSS, a joint process of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was carried out, as required by law.

In Wiltshire there are a number of drivers and constraints that influence the overall scale of housing provision. The main drivers include:

- Population growth
- Housing need
- Economy
- Vacant and second homes

The main constraints are considered to include:

- Market factors
- Infrastructure
- Impact on environmental assets
5.4.12 It is recognised that a balance needs to be struck between delivering affordable, accessible and economically supportive housing, whilst ensuring deliverability and protection of environmental assets. This is where Sustainability Appraisal can play an important role in helping to influence the housing requirement, by ensuring that social, environmental and economic considerations are integrated into policy development.

5.4.13 The following key issues have been identified regarding housing requirements in Wiltshire which future policy will need to resolve:

1. Unsustainable out-commuting flows
2. Provision of sufficient workforce to satisfy future employment opportunities
3. Issues of housing affordability and the need to deliver affordable housing
4. Bringing empty homes back into circulation

5.4.14 In order to identify what might be an appropriate and justifiable approach to calculating the need for housing development, the drivers of housing supply were first considered in order to determine an aspirational supply, before refining this total in light of constraints and other policy-led assumptions. A number of projections have been undertaken which reflect the various assumptions:

- A natural change projection
- A population-led projection
- An employment-led projection
- A job-alignment projection

5.4.15 These projections have produced outputs of a range of dwelling numbers required from between 20,900 and 56,800. However, taking into account issues around deliverability, economic considerations, as well as other drivers and constraints that effect housing delivery, a net dwelling delivery over the plan period (2006-2026) is being considered in the range of 35,800 to 42,100.

5.4.16 This sustainability appraisal has considered whether there are likely to be any significant sustainability effects, positive or negative, of achieving this range of housing. It makes recommendations on potential mitigation measures that could be taken to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects, and concludes what level of housing provision may be most desirable in sustainability terms.

Wiltshire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (April 2010) – key housing issues

5.4.17 The Scoping Report, published by Wiltshire Council in 2010, forms the first stage of the ongoing sustainability appraisal for the Local Development Framework (LDF). That report highlighted a number of key sustainability issues regarding population and housing requirements in Wiltshire, including:
During the period 1971-2001, Wiltshire has experienced higher population growth than at the national level and in relation to the rest of the south west region.

Single person households are predicted to rise from 29% in 2006 to 37% in 2026. This has an impact on housing demand and need for smaller dwellings.

Towns and villages in Wiltshire lack sufficient affordable housing and rented accommodation. It is hard for young people, in particular, to remain in their local communities.

The future expansion and role of Swindon will have a significant impact on development pressures in Wiltshire - Swindon has a major influence on housing demand in north Wiltshire.

Continuing military restructuring will increase housing demand in the Salisbury Plain area.

5.4.18 The Scoping Report acknowledges the high environmental value of much of the Wiltshire landscape, and that the need for new housing will place additional pressures on areas with landscape and biodiversity designations. It also states that housing provision must be fully supported by infrastructure to meet the needs of the whole community, and that additional housing should be balanced by providing additional employment opportunities.

**Sustainability appraisal findings**

5.4.19 This sustainability appraisal has assessed a potential range of housing provision in Wiltshire of between 35,800-42,100 net new dwellings during the plan period 2006-2026. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of likely effects is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely effect</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
<td>+/-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the likely significant effects of 35,800–42,100 net new dwellings in Wiltshire?

5.4.20 The assessment has shown that there are a number of likely significant effects, both positive and negative, when considering provision of housing in this range. The majority of likely significant negative effects are against those objectives that aim to protect and enhance the environment, whilst all of the likely significant positive effects relate to social and economic objectives.

5.4.21 There are many factors that will influence what the actual effects will be – these include the location of development, design considerations, density of development and proximity to environmentally sensitive areas. At this stage, the sustainability appraisal can only highlight what the likely predicted effects might be, given current knowledge, with the aim of influencing the final decision on housing provision.

5.4.22 Overall, housing provision towards the lower end of the range is likely to have fewer impacts on the natural environment, but fewer benefits for communities and the local economy. Housing provision towards the higher end of the range is likely to have greater impacts on the natural environment, but greater benefits for communities and the local economy.

Significant positive effects

5.4.23 Housing provision, at the right level and in the right place, will help meet the growing need for housing of all types in an area with a growing population. The right level of housing can influence affordability, a key issue in Wiltshire, allowing more people to own their own home and to live in a decent home. Housing provision in a settlement can also improve self-containment, allowing people to fulfil more of their daily needs within their community rather than having to travel elsewhere.

5.4.24 Increasing delivery may have a positive impact on housing affordability in Wiltshire, and should increase levels of affordable housing provision. Provision at the lower end of the range may not improve affordability significantly. Consideration should be given, in particular, to affordability issues in rural areas, working with communities to provide much needed affordable housing in villages. Housing should also be located in sustainable locations that allow easy access to a range of local services and facilities, reducing the need to travel and providing employment locally which will help reduce out-commuting.

5.4.25 Increasing levels of housing provision can also have significant benefits for the local economy and employment opportunities. Housing can support the economy by providing a working age population that may attract employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). The construction industry will be supported by housing delivery and a larger population, with a corresponding increase in disposable income in the area, will support the local economy and viability of town centres.

5.4.26 It is vital that housing delivery is supported by a corresponding increase in employment opportunities, supporting the local economy and helping to reduce out-
commuting (a key issue in Wiltshire). Housing delivery without investment in job creation will increase unsustainable out-commuting to places such as Swindon, Bath and Bristol.

5.4.27 Housing provision should support the viability and vitality of town centres. Where housing development takes place on the edge of town, new services and facilities, especially retail, should not compete with the existing town centre. However, mixed-use development which offers opportunities for people to work and shop locally will still be important and will reduce the need to travel. Housing development, in all locations, should be supported by strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by private car.

5.4.28 The sustainability appraisal considers that there are likely positive effects against a number of other sustainability objectives:

- Providing a safe and healthy place to live.
- Reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive and self contained communities.
- Improving equality of access to, and engagement in local, high-quality community services and facilities.
- Raising educational attainment levels across the authority and providing opportunities for people to improve their workplace skills.

5.4.29 The significance of any benefits in these areas will depend on the type of development being provided, the location and the level of investment that is provided in the local community, in terms of improving existing facilities or providing new ones.

**Significant negative effects and potential mitigation measures**

5.4.30 The proposed range of housing provision is likely to adversely affect a number of the environmental related objectives, as well as transport. There are potential significant negative effects regarding loss of greenfield and high value agricultural land, increased pressures on water resources, increased impacts on climate change and an increase in travel demand (particularly by private car).

5.4.31 Providing a lower level of housing is likely to reduce these impacts. However, even if providing housing at the higher end of the range, there will still be significant opportunities to mitigate many of the impacts highlighted providing there are strong policies promoting environmental protection within the LDF.

5.4.32 Location and design of development are very important considerations; careful consideration can help reduce the effects of development on biodiversity, water resources, waste production, landscape, flood risk, air quality and environmental pollution and the historic environment. Development should be located to avoid areas of high environmental sensitivity and protect and enhance other environmental and historical assets.
Given the rural nature of much of Wiltshire and the overall lack of previously developed land compared with other more industrial areas, it is likely that much housing development will take place, unavoidably, on greenfield land. Wherever possible, areas of best and most valuable agricultural land should be protected from development and appropriate housing densities considered that will reduce loss of greenfield land overall.

This level of housing is likely to significantly increase demand for water from household use, even if strong measures are in place to reduce water use. There are significant pressures on riverine systems in Wiltshire and neighbouring authorities from water abstraction and elevated phosphate levels in the River Avon SAC. Strong measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use should be incorporated in all future development, and development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses. Appropriate infrastructure will also be required to deal with foul and surface water, and to resolve current issues regarding phosphate levels.

Housing provision on this scale is likely to significantly increase emissions that can cause climate change, mainly through energy use in the home and associated travel. It is important that all future housing development incorporates high levels of energy efficiency in the home to reduce emissions, with low/zero carbon technologies, renewable forms of energy on and/or offsite, and consideration of CHP and district heating schemes. Mixed-use development and significant investment in sustainable transport modes will reduce car use. However, it is very likely that private car use will increase considerably, and this poses sustainability concerns in a number of areas.

Location and density of housing can play an important role in making public transport viable and accessible, thereby increasing the likelihood that people will choose to travel by this mode. Allowing more convenient and accessible public transport options will also benefit the local economy by reducing traffic congestion, particularly in town centres, making them more pleasant locations for residents and visitors.

Summary

The aim of this assessment has been to highlight the potential effects of providing housing in Wiltshire up to 2026, with a view to achieving development that is sustainable. Sustainability appraisal can help ensure that sustainable development is pursued in an integrated manner, whereby development plans meet environmental, social and economic objectives together over time. Community involvement will be an essential element in delivering sustainable development and creating safe and healthy communities.

It is important that when deciding on a level of housing provision, it is recognised that development, if properly planned, can have positive social and environmental benefits, and that environmental protection and enhancement can also provide important benefits for the economy and for health and well-being. The assessment has indicated that housing provision is likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of economic development and social inclusion, but also some significant negative
impacts on the environment, particularly at the higher end of the housing range, if appropriate mitigation measures are not fully incorporated.

5.4.39 Housing provision can support the local economy by providing a working age population that may attract employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). The corresponding increase in disposable income in Wiltshire, from an increased population, would help support the local economy and viability of town centres. However, it is vital that housing development is supported by a significant increase in employment provision that helps reduce the already significant levels of out-commuting, by allowing people the choice to work more locally.

5.4.40 Any housing provision in the range of 35,800-42,100 is likely to have adverse effects on the natural environment and particularly at the higher end of the range i.e. 40,000+ dwellings. Specific issues that have been highlighted in the assessment include the potential loss of greenfield and high value agricultural land (given Wiltshire’s rural location), increased pressures on water resources, increased greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change and the effects of housing provision, and consequent population increase, on the need to travel.

5.4.41 It is acknowledged that many of the potential environmental impacts could be successfully mitigated or reduced through careful consideration of location and incorporation of high levels of sustainability. At this stage, however, the assessment is strategic and is not considering specific locations or specific development proposals that may lead to significant environmental benefits. It is also worth noting the conclusion of the South West Regional Spatial Strategy Sustainability Appraisal which stated that “the pace of development will require strict adherence to policies that aim to protect and enhance the environment, both in terms of location and design”. The Sustainability appraisal will help ensure that ongoing policy development for Wiltshire’s will contain such policies.

5.4.42 Housing provision towards the lower end of the range may not achieve required community and economic benefits, particularly in terms of affordable housing, attracting inward investment and infrastructure provision. Consequently, housing provision towards the higher end of the range may lead to environmental impacts that are difficult to mitigate and that may also adversely affect the achievement of other social and economic goals.

5.4.43 It is likely that in order to best achieve a balance between protecting and enhancing the environment and pursuing housing growth that will lead to significant social and economic benefits, a mid-range housing scenario should be pursued, provided there are strong links to Core Strategy policies that will ensure housing growth is sustainable.

Previously developed land

5.4.44 Core policy 2 sets a target for development on previously developed land of ‘at least 35%’ in accordance with PPS3 which requires Local Planning Authorities to set a
local target and trajectory. Alternatives to this have been considered and a summary of the sustainability appraisal findings follows.

**What options have been considered?**

5.4.45 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41% of development will be on previously developed land in Wiltshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35% of development will be on previously developed land in Wiltshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Separate community area targets will be set for development on previously developed land. The benefit of this would be that it could be tailored to the community area, for example, in an area with a large amount of redundant MoD land a higher target could be set and in an area with a lot of small rural villages a lower target could be set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.46 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives and a summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.4.47 No significant adverse effects are thought likely through these policy options. The main area of concern is that too high a target is set that promotes development on previously developed land but at the same time prevents much needed housing and employment development, particularly in larger towns such as Trowbridge and Chippenham, where homes and jobs are needed but where previously developed land is not abundant.

5.4.48 The location of any sites will determine what environmental impacts may occur. Some sites, despite being previously developed, may be of high ecological value, particularly those sites which have been derelict for many years. Other sites may be
in close proximity to areas or buildings of historic importance and any new development should be designed and constructed sensitively to these.

5.4.49 In terms of significant benefits, Options 1 and 3 are similar. Option 1 proposes a higher target and therefore will maximise development of previously developed land and the efficient and effective use of land. Development of previously developed land is also likely to significantly aid town centre regeneration; however this depends on whether town centre sites are developed and for what purpose they are developed.

5.4.50 Option 3 proposes higher targets in those areas that have larger amounts of previously developed land. This is therefore more likely to result in previously developed land sites in those areas being developed, with likely significant long-term benefits for urban and rural landscapes – pressures on greenfield sites in those locations may be less as a result, with an improved townscape. These benefits very much depend on the location of any development and for what use the land is being developed for.

5.4.51 It is not known what targets would be set under Option 3 and therefore difficult to assess effects at this stage. Some areas of Wiltshire such as Corsham have a relatively high amount of previously developed land sites but demand for new homes and employment land is not as high in Corsham as for larger towns such as Trowbridge and Chippenham. Should a proportionately larger number of houses and employment land be allocated for Corsham and other areas with previously developed land than those with little?

5.4.52 The significance of any benefits will depend on the location of sites that are being developed, the uses to which the site is being put and the effects this will have on provision of jobs, homes (and particularly affordable homes) and benefits for the local economy. If the overall benefits of greenfield development for a town or area are greater in sustainability terms than developing previously developed land sites, greenfield development should be considered.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.4.53 No significant effects were thought likely through any of the 3 options. However, as has previously been stated, a target should be found that balances environmental protection, through protecting sensitive areas of greenfield land and those that are valued locally for health and wellbeing, recreation and biodiversity, and allowing for housing and employment provision and the social, economic (and environmental) benefits this can bring.

5.4.54 As well as setting a target, development of previously developed land should be prioritised in town centres to help stimulate regeneration, benefiting the local economy and reducing pressures on edge of town greenfield sites. Development of previously developed land within or near to town centres would benefit from proximity to good public transport services and access to key services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel and giving a greater choice of travel options.
5.4.55 Waste produced from land remediation should be recycled wherever possible and this issue should be discussed in policy supporting text or in the topic paper. This is likely to be more of an issue with higher targets. There also needs to be strong pollution prevention measures in place when remediating polluted sites.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.4.56 Option 1 and Option 3 are likely to realise the most sustainability benefits in Wiltshire if a 41% target can be justified and if appropriate targets are set in each community area that promote previously developed land development but which do not make development unviable.

5.4.57 Option 2 will not lead to any significant adverse effects but may not sufficiently prioritise previously developed land development, leading to development of greenfield sites at the expense of town centre sites that would best aid town centre regeneration efforts.

5.5 **Core policy 3: Infrastructure requirements**

5.5.1 The anticipated level of economic and housing growth within Wiltshire over the next 20 years is expected to increase demand on local infrastructure and services. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that infrastructure and service requirements are appropriately secured and implemented and to achieve the Core Strategy objective of ‘to secure appropriate infrastructure and services’.

5.5.2 PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) requires the provision of essential infrastructure and that infrastructure and services are provided to support new and existing economic development and housing. PPS12 sets out the need for local planning authorities to adopt a co-ordinating role in the delivery of infrastructure. This role is expected to be undertaken through the Local Development Framework, or more specifically the Core Strategy. It states

“The core strategy should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed for the area, taking account of its type and distribution”.

**What options have been considered?**

5.5.3 Policy options being considered for this core policy are as follows (further evidence demonstrating why these options are being considered is contained within the infrastructure topic paper which accompanies the Core Strategy):
### Policy option Description

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Status Quo - continue with the existing approach to securing planning obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broader, more consistent approach to section 106 planning obligations but <strong>do not</strong> adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy (plus Option 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.4 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.5.5 No significant effects, either positive or negative, are envisaged through Options 1 and 2. Both options, if continued or adopted, would be likely to result in minor effects or neutral effects.

5.5.6 Option 1 would continue to provide ‘key’ types of infrastructure such as education facilities and transport related facilities on a negotiated site-by-site basis, so some infrastructure would still be provided as a result of growth. However, these policies were adopted by different local authorities, they have been shown to be inconsistent and often rely on an inadequate evidence base. These policies cover a limited range of infrastructure and are unsuccessful in addressing the cumulative impacts of smaller developments. No significant effects are envisaged.

5.5.7 Option 2 performs slightly better and would possibly provide more benefits by seeking to meet a wider range of infrastructure needs. It would be based upon an up-to-date infrastructure planning evidence base and delivery plan but some infrastructure needs will not be met because they are not site-specific and Section 106 agreements would be severely limited in terms of what can be achieved by pooled contributions. No significant effects are envisaged.
5.5.8 Option 3 will provide a number of significant benefits because it would cover site-specific infrastructure as well as infrastructure covering a much wider area. Many infrastructure needs result not just from large developments but from many smaller developments across Wiltshire which have significant cumulative impacts. These developments often do not make appropriate levels of contributions and CIL would allow more scope for pooled contributions to local, sub-regional or regional infrastructure.

5.5.9 It is considered that Option 3 is likely to be able to make significant contributions towards biodiversity protection and enhancement through a GI network that can address habitat fragmentation caused by the cumulative impacts of developments, and provide many other health and wellbeing, recreational, economic and environmental benefits. Option 3 will also likely be the best vehicle for addressing impacts of developments that can often cover a wide area, including water resources, landscape issues, flooding and air quality. These impacts are often indirect and secondary, occurring away from the development site and occurring over a long period of time.

5.5.10 Significant benefits could also be achieved through Option 3 in terms of social inclusion and cohesion, allowing local communities to be involved in decision-making over what funds get allocated to. Impacts of development often affect existing communities, putting pressure on local facilities and community services and CIL could fund small, local projects, or contribute towards wider schemes. Local people will have a very good idea what services aren’t working and what needs improvement.

5.5.11 It is acknowledged in the assessment that there is much uncertainty over exactly how CIL will operate in practice. The CIL Bill (April, 2010) narrowed the scope of Section 106 agreements down to the provision of on-site infrastructure and affordable housing, while the rest of the benefits from development will be paid for through CIL. This means that a wide range of infrastructure will only be provided through CIL, restricting Section 106 agreements severely, and therefore Option 2 is very unlikely to be a viable option.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.5.12 The assessment is not predicting significant adverse effects as the policy options address provision of a wide range of infrastructure to meet the needs arising from housing and economic growth across Wiltshire. However, there are a number of issues which an infrastructure policy should address.

5.5.13 Levels of anticipated housing provision through the Core Strategy are lower than that proposed through the Regional Spatial Strategy, and therefore infrastructure provision could arguably also be lower. However, the growth proposed will lead to continued increases in traffic on Wiltshire’s roads and there must be careful consideration of transport infrastructure, with a focus on sustainable transport modes,
especially public transport, walking and cycling. Mixed-use development with local service provision will also reduce travel need.

5.5.14 Infrastructure needs will be wide and varied and it is not for this report to detail all that will be required. However, of particular importance in Wiltshire will be climate change mitigation and adaptation, dealing with levels of phosphates (and other pollutants) in rivers and providing adequate levels of affordable housing. The widely acknowledged issue of out-commuting should be addressed through creation of employment opportunities to match housing growth.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.5.15 Option 3 is the most favourable option when assessed against all sustainability objectives and when compared against the other two proposed alternatives. It is the only option capable of providing the wide range of infrastructure that will be needed across Wiltshire to meet need arising from proposed levels of housing and economic growth, and the only option that will allow the pooling of contributions in the long-term towards local and strategic infrastructure requirements to address the cumulative impacts of development.

5.5.16 From 6th April 2010, it has been unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development that is capable of being charged CIL, whether CIL is in operation or not, if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
(b) directly related to the development; and
(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

5.5.17 This effectively means that Options 1 and 2 are not appropriate or realistic ways forward for providing for infrastructure needs over the next 20 years.

**5.6 Core Policy 4 – Chippenham Central Area of Opportunity**

5.6.1 Regeneration of the central area of Chippenham is a priority and a number of local plan sites in the town provide regeneration opportunities and are being carried forward into the Core Strategy. This is being led by the Chippenham Vision Board representing key stakeholders in the town.

**What options have been considered?**

5.6.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
Policy option | Description
--- | ---
1 | Adopt the policy as proposed; that is, development with the benefit of an over-arching Vision
2 | Develop sites as Option 1, but in accordance with standard planning policies and without the benefit of an over-arching vision

5.6.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?/+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>?/+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.6.4 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of biodiversity, rural and urban landscapes, housing, transport, economy and employment. In all cases Option 1, implementing the policy as proposed, is likely to have more significant and positive effects, as it benefits from a cohesive overall plan aimed at achieving sustainability goals as well as growth. The overall nature of the plan is likely to enable efficiency savings and the pooling of resources, again more likely to achieve a positive sustainability outcome.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.6.5 Option 1 does not generate any significant adverse effects. Option 2’s adverse effects in all the relevant areas could be partially, though not wholly mitigated through strong planning policies and proactive development management.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.6.6 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive impacts. Option 2 contains less positive impacts and would be harder to implement and regulate to achieve the same results.
5.7 Core Policy 5 – Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area

5.7.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

What options have been considered?

5.7.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not regulate development according to an overall spatial strategy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.7.4 The significant positive and negative effects highlighted relate mainly to the levels of housing and employment growth proposed in Chippenham. Further discussion is provided later in this section on individual site options for Chippenham and on the two strategic options included in Core Policy 5 in the Core Strategy.

5.7.5 The level of growth proposed will have many benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. There are significant employment opportunities through provision of approx 31.5-34 ha of employment land.
5.7.6 There are specific issues concerning development in Chippenham in relation to the River Avon and Birds Marsh Wood. These issues have been discussed in the assessments for strategic sites in Chippenham. If development is to take place in proximity to these sensitive areas, strong protection and enhancement measures will be required, including long-term management. Both options will also involve significant loss of Greenfield land, some of which is designated as best and most versatile agricultural land.

5.7.7 Both options promote significant growth which will lead to significant greenhouse gas emissions from energy use and travel.

5.7.8 Level of growth proposed is likely to increase private car use generally, despite investment in sustainable transport infrastructure. There are currently serious issues with congestion on the A350, A4 and through the town centre, particularly during peak times. Further traffic modelling would be required to provide clarification that is beyond the scope of this sustainability appraisal.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the significant adverse effects?

5.7.9 Appropriate ecological surveys should be undertaken to determine impacts on existing biodiversity assets, including protected species, priority habitat areas and Birds Marsh Wood CWS. Mature trees and significantly diverse hedgerows should be retained wherever possible. Measures to reduce impacts of noise and light pollution resulting from housing, employment and road traffic will need serious consideration. The issue of recreational pressure on Birds Marsh Wood would need to be resolved, perhaps through limiting access or creating significant GI links that are more convenient for people to use. Strong protection and enhancement measures will be required, including long-term management of Birds Marsh Wood and River Avon and associated habitats.

5.7.10 There is strong potential for mitigation of climate change impacts in Chippenham. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to provide renewable forms of energy on development sites, and to link in with adjoining residential and employment areas. The effects of transport must also be established through further transport modelling.

5.7.11 Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Further traffic modelling required, in particular gauging effects on Chippenham town centre and on A350/A4.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.7.12 Both options are very similar in their assessment scores. However, Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to
developments to come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised. Effects would very much depend on where development is located, the type of development and mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

Strategic housing sites in Chippenham

5.7.13 Core policy 5 is currently proposing 2250 new homes in Chippenham on strategic sites. Two options have been identified to provide these 2250 dwellings on strategic greenfield sites on the edge of Chippenham, and these options are discussed later in this section.

5.7.14 Prior to the identification of these two options, the following potential strategic sites for Chippenham were assessed through the sustainability appraisal process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chippenham potential option</th>
<th>Description of potential option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a - North Chippenham (North Chippenham Consortium)</td>
<td>Land North of Chippenham promoted by the North Chippenham Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b - North Chippenham (Robert Hitchins)</td>
<td>Land north of Barrow farm and east of Birds Marsh Wood – promoted by Robert Hitchins Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - East Chippenham</td>
<td>Land East of Chippenham; land North of London Road and Stanley Lane; Abbeyfield School; Forest Gate Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Forest Farm</td>
<td>Land at Forest Farm, south east of Chippenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – South of Pewsham</td>
<td>Land south of Pewsham Way and land south of Pewsham; land opposite Showell Farm and land east of Lackham College and Showell Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Patterdown and Rowden</td>
<td>Land at Patterdown and Rowden; The Paddock; Land at Milbourne Farm; Showell Nurseries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Hunters Moon</td>
<td>Hunters Moon; Land at Chippneham Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – West Chippenham</td>
<td>Land at West Chippenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Town centre strategic site</td>
<td>Chippenham town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.15 These sites were promoted to Wiltshire Council by developers and/or other stakeholders and these are shown on the map on the following page.

**Key to map options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Shaded area on map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a/1b</td>
<td>Turquoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Light blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.16 The full sustainability appraisal of each site is presented in Appendix G. A summary of the sustainability appraisal findings is presented below, showing likely significant adverse effects in red and likely significant positive effects in green:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site option</th>
<th>1 Biodiversity</th>
<th>2 Land and soil</th>
<th>3 Waste</th>
<th>4 Water resources</th>
<th>5 Flood risk</th>
<th>6 Pollution</th>
<th>7 Climate change</th>
<th>8 Historic</th>
<th>9 Landscapes</th>
<th>10 Housing</th>
<th>11 Health</th>
<th>12 Poverty deprivation</th>
<th>13 Community facilities</th>
<th>14 Education and skills</th>
<th>15 Transport</th>
<th>16 Economy</th>
<th>17 Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham option 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+/++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of likely significant effects – Option 1a

5.7.17 Potential for significant adverse effects relating to Birds Marsh Wood from proposed housing development, mainly concerning indirect effects such as recreational disturbance and noise/light disturbance. There are potential mitigation measures but further information would be required to assess significance of effects.

5.7.18 No significant benefits envisaged; development is likely to benefit the local economy but not considered significant due to relatively small scale of employment land provision.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 1a

5.7.19 Appropriate ecological surveys should be undertaken to determine impacts on existing biodiversity assets, including protected species, priority habitat and Birds Marsh Wood County Wildlife Site. The issue of recreational pressure on Birds Marsh Wood would need to be resolved, perhaps through limiting access or creating significant GI links that are more convenient for people to use. A sufficient sized buffer zone would be required.

Summary of likely significant effects – Option 1b

5.7.20 There are significant concerns over proximity of Birds Marsh Wood, designated a County Wildlife Site, ancient woodland and priority habitat area. Development likely to increase recreational pressure on this area, as well as increase impacts such as noise and light pollution. A significant proportion of this site is Grade 1 agricultural land.

5.7.21 Residential development in this location further from town centre than Option 1 and less accessible. A new distributor road may be needed which will increase accessibility of M4/A350 by car and may increase out-commuting. Site would allow good access to Parsonage Way industrial estate with proximity providing walking/cycling possibilities. However, overall, levels of traffic likely to significantly increase within Chippenham.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 1b

5.7.22 The issue of recreational pressure on Birds Marsh Wood would need to be resolved, perhaps through limiting access or creating significant GI links that are more convenient for people to use. Inclusion of an appropriate buffer zone (strategic open space) to Birds Marsh Wood must be provided. However, main impacts likely to be indirect.

5.7.23 Locating development adjacent to the existing urban area would give better access to local facilities and public transport links than a more remote development site.
Housing development should be built at maximum viable densities to minimise greenfield loss.

5.7.24 Strong promotion of (and investment in) public transport and walking/cycling routes linking the town centre and local services/facilities, including employment areas, will be required. Existing traffic modelling suggests that development in north Chippenham will help prevent further congestion in the town centre but additional traffic modelling will be required.

Summary of likely significant effects – Option 2

5.7.25 Potential for significant adverse effects regarding loss of greenfield land, a proportion of which is Grade 1 agricultural land. A development on the scale proposed is also likely to significantly increase emissions that could impact upon climate change.

5.7.26 Significant benefits in terms of housing provision that could meet much of the local need for new housing. There is scope for a large number of affordable dwellings within this option, but this information is not available at this stage. Significant benefits may also be reasonably expected in terms of health and wellbeing from provision of modern housing and associated health/leisure/recreational/social facilities that can help encourage healthy living.

5.7.27 Significant benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. Development could also aid town centre regeneration. Development on this scale, however, is likely to significantly increase pressure on the highway network which already experiences high levels of congestion, particularly at peak times.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 2

5.7.28 Locating development adjacent to the existing urban area, and maximising densities, would give better access to local facilities and public transport links than a more remote development site. There appears to be little or no possibility of development on brownfield land or redeveloping existing buildings at this location.

5.7.29 There is strong potential for mitigation of climate change impacts at this site. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to provide renewable forms of energy and heat on site, and to link in with adjoining residential areas.

5.7.30 Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Further traffic modelling required, in particular gauging effects on Chippenham town centre and on A350/A4.
Summary of likely significant effects – Option 3

5.7.31 No significant positive or negative effects considered likely at this site. The majority of development would take place on greenfield, agricultural land. However, no specific environmental constraints to development in terms of effects on any designated areas. Social and economic benefits are likely from provision of circa 700 new dwellings and scope for large number of affordable dwellings. This site, however, is not large enough to meet anticipated housing demand in Chippenham and would need to be combined with other sites.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 3

5.7.32 No significant adverse effects considered likely. However, there is a designated special landscape area to the south and east of this site and particular consideration should be given to mitigating any impacts on that area. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.

Summary of likely significant effects – Option 4

5.7.33 Significant adverse effects in relation to land and soil. The majority of this site is greenfield, agricultural land and an area of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land lies in the western part of this site.

5.7.34 Development on this scale likely to significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions compared to current situation, through construction, energy use in the home/workplace and subsequent travel. A development of this size and in this location is also likely to increase private car use generally, despite any investment in sustainable transport infrastructure. There are currently serious issues with congestion on the A350, A4 and through the town centre, particularly during peak times.

5.7.35 Significant benefits likely in relation to potential provision of large numbers of dwellings and therefore scope for large number of affordable dwellings. This site likely to be a large mixed-use development and the size of the site allows for provision of a significant area of green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation facilities that can allow for healthy lifestyles. This size of development can also have many benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 4

5.7.36 Locating development adjacent to the existing urban area, and maximising densities, would give better access to local facilities and public transport links than a more remote development site. There appears to be little or no possibility of development on brownfield land or redeveloping existing buildings at this location.
5.7.37 There is strong potential for mitigation of climate change impacts at this site. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to provide renewable forms of energy and heat on site, and to link in with adjoining residential areas.

5.7.38 Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Further traffic modelling required, in particular gauging effects on Chippenham town centre and on A350/A4.

**Summary of likely significant effects – Option 5**

5.7.39 There are no environmental constraints that would act as a showstopper to development in this location. There are significant local designations, particularly in the vicinity of the River Avon, but no national or European designations. The appraisal has noted the potential for significant adverse effects regarding loss of greenfield land, a proportion of which is Grade 1 agricultural land. A development on the scale proposed is also likely to significantly increase emissions that could impact upon climate change.

5.7.40 Significant benefits in terms of housing provision that could meet much of the local need for new housing. There is scope for a large number of affordable dwellings within this option. Significant benefits may also be reasonably expected in terms of health and wellbeing from provision of modern housing and associated health/leisure/recreational/social facilities that can help encourage healthy living.

5.7.41 Significant benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. Development could also aid town centre regeneration. This scale of development, however, is likely to significantly increase pressure on the highway network which already experiences high levels of congestion, particularly at peak times.

**Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 5**

5.7.42 Locating development adjacent to the existing urban area, and maximising densities, would give better access to local facilities and public transport links than a more remote development site. There appears to be little or no possibility of development on brownfield land or redeveloping existing buildings at this location.

5.7.43 There is strong potential for mitigation of climate change impacts at this site. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to provide renewable forms of energy and heat on site, and to link in with adjoining residential areas.
Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Further traffic modelling required, in particular to gauge effects on Chippenham town centre and on A350/A4.

Summary of likely significant effects – Option 6

There are few environmental constraints to development at this location. No anticipated significant effects, positive or negative. Particular consideration should be given to mitigating any adverse landscape impacts on the special landscape area to the west at Corsham Park. Benefits are likely from provision of circa 800 new dwellings and scope for affordable dwellings. This site, however, is not large enough to meet anticipated housing demand in Chippenham and would need to be combined with other sites.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 6

No significant adverse effects envisaged. Any development on this site should be sensitive to the rural character of the area. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation with regards to the special landscape area to the west.

Summary of likely significant effects – Option 7

Few significant effects considered likely. There are potential significant effects regarding protection of heritage assets - there is a district Conservation Area in the north of this site, as well as listed buildings at Foxhill House, The Cottage and Manor Farm. To the south, Sheldon Farm/Manor is a listed building and there is a SAM and historic park and garden. This area around Sheldon Manor is particularly sensitive and development could impact on the setting of this area.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 7

Any development should avoid any adverse impacts on designated and undesignated heritage features, and their setting - this includes impacts on the Conservation Area to the north, other listed buildings and the area around Sheldon Manor.
Summary of likely significant effects – Option 8

5.7.50 No significant adverse effects noted, although this will depend on the location and type of any proposed development. Option 8 covers a large area of urban Chippenham from the north-east to south-west. There are concerns in relation to flood risk in some areas associated with the River Avon and potential impacts if development located in proximity to the Chippenham Conservation Area.

5.7.51 This is a large strategic option with proposals for development on brownfield and greenfield sites. Overall, effects likely to be positive if priority given to developing brownfield sites and at higher densities near to the town centre. Development in this location most likely to help town centre regeneration and this could help provide wide ranging new community facilities such as sports and leisure and cultural facilities.

5.7.52 This location is the preferred option in terms of public transport accessibility and proximity to local services/facilities. Development in the town centre can reduce the need to travel and reduce car journeys because of proximity to bus/rail hubs. Further transport modelling should be undertaken to establish extent of possible impacts and whether development could actually lead to increases in town centre congestion.

Summary of potential mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset likely significant adverse effects – Option 8

5.7.53 No significant adverse effects are considered at this time, but this will depend on future development and location. Inappropriate development should be located away from areas of flood risk and Surface Water Management Strategies may be required for all potential sites.

5.7.54 Any development should avoid adverse impacts on designated and undesignated heritage features, and their setting. Careful consideration of design standards are required to avoid adverse impacts. Development should be in keeping with existing urban form and respect the character of the area. Further archaeological survey work would be required prior to any development. Sensitive re-use of historical buildings and buildings of significant local interest should be promoted, and attempts to improve and broaden access to, and understanding of, local heritage and historic sites in Chippenham.

Overall summary of options and recommendations

5.7.55 In terms of significant positive effects, the town centre strategic option is likely to give the greatest benefits overall in terms of proximity to existing services, facilities and public transport hubs, making use of brownfield sites and being able to provide higher density development. This location may also reduce travel need and provide the greatest employment opportunities. However, in terms of housing provision, it is only likely to meet a fraction of future need in Chippenham and there are some constraints relating to impacts of development on heritage areas, listed buildings and valued landscapes, including the River Avon meadows.
5.7.56 The larger urban extension proposals, in the south and east, are very similar in their assessment scores, and further detailed information would be required to be able to differentiate further. There are few specific environmental constraints to development in these areas, apart from the River Avon corridor. Development proposals for options in the south and east propose protection/enhancement measures for the River Avon and its floodplain and the options appear to be large enough to accommodate development without encroaching on areas of flood risk. Proposals for both areas also include significant transport infrastructure, including a new distributor road, the impacts of which will require further analysis. Both options are capable of providing a wide range of infrastructure and community facilities that this size of development would need.

5.7.57 Smaller options assessed, on their own, will not result in the same level of environmental, social and economic benefits as the larger options across the wide range of sustainability objectives, unless combined with the larger options. They are unlikely to meet housing and employment land need on their own or generate the level of contributions towards infrastructure, transport, education, healthcare and community/recreational facilities that Chippenham needs. However, the smaller size of these sites and their location means there are fewer environmental impacts than the larger options and this assessment has shown that there are no absolute constraints to development at any of the options; other studies of Chippenham's needs will ultimately feed into the decision making process.

5.7.58 The sustainability appraisal, at this stage, is unable to recommend any one particular site above other options. Development could be considered in a number of locations to maximise the strengths that each site offers, whilst avoiding areas of particular environmental concern, including the River Avon meadows and Birds Marsh Wood. It is recommended that further consideration is given to the locations for strategic housing in Chippenham, taking account of the findings of this work.

Appraisal of Core Policy 5 strategic housing options

5.7.59 Two strategic options have now been identified in the Core Strategy for Chippenham to provide the 2250 dwellings on strategic greenfield sites on the edge of Chippenham – these amended options take into account the findings of the sustainability appraisal work, summarised in previous pages, and further consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties.

5.7.60 The following policy options have been developed. These options aim to accommodate sustainable development at the town in light of the proposed reduction in the overall number of homes to be provided during the plan period. This has led to the other options previously consulted on being discounted at this stage (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
5.7.61 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delivery of suitable brownfield sites in the town; Non Strategic site- land SW Abbeyfield School; Strategic Option 1: North East Chippenham Site Allocation; South West Chippenham Area of Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delivery of suitable brownfield sites in the town; Non Strategic site- land SW Abbeyfield School; Strategic Option 2: North East Chippenham Site Allocation; South West Chippenham Area of Search; East Chippenham Site Allocation;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed Option 1</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

**Significant environmental effects**

5.7.62 Developing brownfield sites is likely to result in significant benefits in terms of making efficient and effective use of land. Developing brownfield sites that are close to the town centre will benefit from proximity to public transport hubs and a concentration of services and facilities. This may reduce the need travel, offer significant alternatives to car use and reduce demand for greenfield development. However, significance of any benefits will depend on the extent of development, type and location.

5.7.63 The two options being considered in this appraisal involve considerable new development, primarily on greenfield sites, and this is not likely to result in positive environmental effects. However, this is very much dependent on the type of development, where it is located with regards to sensitive environmental receptors and the extent of any enhancement measures undertaken, such as habitat creation and protection.

5.7.64 There are no national or European wildlife or landscape designations in and around Chippenham that constrain development. Designated sites such as the River Avon and Birds Marsh Wood are non-statutory locally designated County Wildlife Sites.
However, these are locally important and development of the strategic sites should protect and enhance such areas wherever possible.

5.7.65 The NE Chippenham site is considered likely to have significant adverse impacts on Birds Marsh Wood and the landscape surrounding it. Birds Marsh Wood is designated as a County Wildlife Site, ancient woodland and priority habitat area and development in proximity is likely to increase recreational pressure on this area from activities such as dog walking, as well as increased impacts such as noise and light pollution. The policy proposals provide for a buffer zone that will mitigate against direct loss; however it is indirect effects which are the concern.

5.7.66 The strategic sites in both options (NE Chippenham site, Area of Search and East Chippenham site) will lead to loss of significant areas of greenfield land. In the case of the Area of search and East Chippenham sites that is significant because of the presence of Grade 1 and 2 best and most versatile agricultural land.

5.7.67 Significant adverse effects have not been attributed to Area of Search and East Chippenham that include the River Avon County Wildlife Site because of its non-statutory, local designation. The policy seeks to preserve and enhance areas concerned, including the establishment of buffer zones and a Country Park. However, further surveys should be undertaken to establish impacts because impacts will likely relate to indirect effects on the setting of places and from recreational pressure, and increases in noise and light levels. Significance of effects will be dependent on the extent of measures taken to protect and enhance this locally important and valued area.

5.7.68 The policy and two options are likely to be significantly negative in terms of reducing impacts on climate change, compared to the current situation. This relates mainly to energy use in buildings and increased need to travel, and associated emissions.

**Significant social effects**

5.7.69 There are likely be significant positive effects in terms of housing provision, including social housing, due to the amount of housing proposed. 4500 dwellings are proposed in the Chippenham community area, of which 4000 will be in Chippenham. 2250 of those will be new dwellings on strategic sites. This will significantly extend housing choice. Housing provision can provide modern accommodation for an expanding workforce, attract skilled workers (and their families) to the area and provide a larger customer base for local businesses.

5.7.70 The NE Chippenham, Area of Search and East Chippenham sites are likely to be large mixed-use developments and the size of the sites allows for provision of a significant area of green infrastructure, open space, community and sport and recreation facilities that can increase opportunities for healthy lifestyles. Employment and educational facilities are also likely to be incorporated that may increase self-containment and social inclusion.
5.7.71 Brownfield sites are likely to result in more significant social benefits. However, the level of housing provision on brownfield sites is not significant compared to the strategic sites, but development here can provide significant investment in new or enhanced community, educational, employment and skills related facilities which in turn can revitalise the area and increase the viability of town centre businesses. This is very much dependent on the scale, type and location of any development and the level of social benefits that can be gained.

5.7.72 Social effects considered in this sustainability appraisal relate to the areas of housing provision, providing a safe and healthy environment, reducing poverty and deprivation and improving access to community facilities. None of the options are considered likely to lead to adverse impacts in these areas.

**Significant economic effects**

5.7.73 Effects on the local economy are likely to be significantly positive provided the proposed strategic sites in both options provide the employment opportunities and infrastructure necessary. Any development should have strong and accessible links to Chippenham town centre to help aid regeneration, not compete with it. Provision of a large area for employment use would also increase benefits and help reduce the significant issue of out-commuting. Strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure will help reduce potential traffic congestion, particularly on the A350, A4 and in the town centre.

5.7.74 Developing brownfield sites is likely to significantly reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. This is due to the location of many of the sites close to public transport hubs and proximity of other services and facilities that could be accessed by walking and cycling.

5.7.75 The strategic sites on the edge of the urban area, although they are likely to include sustainable transport links and the possibility of new bus services, will increase the possibility of additional car journeys significantly. New distributor roads, whilst possibly allowing greater access to the A350, A4 and M4, are likely to make car travel more attractive, despite any improvements in public transport services. Further traffic modelling would be required to provide clarification; that is beyond the scope of this sustainability appraisal.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the significant adverse effects?**

5.7.76 The policy seeks to preserve and enhance Birds Marsh Wood, the River Avon and the Rowden Conservation Areas through the establishment of buffer zones and a Country Park. However, further surveys should be undertaken to establish impacts because impacts will likely relate to indirect effects on the setting of places and from recreational pressure, and increases in noise and light levels. Effects would be dependent on the extent of measures taken to protect and enhance these locally important and valued areas.
5.7.77 The proposals for a buffer zone between development at NE Chippenham and Birds Marsh Wood may mitigate against direct loss. However it is indirect effects which are the concern. Mitigation measures include limiting access to the woodland and providing a significant area of new green infrastructure for people to use.

5.7.78 Planning policy advises it is desirable to retain the highest quality agricultural land for future food production. Given the greenfield nature of the strategic sites in both options and insufficient number of brownfield sites in Chippenham to meet potential housing need, mitigation measures are likely to involve trying to avoid developing areas of highest quality land, together with building at maximum viable densities to reduce land loss. Locating development adjacent to the existing urban area would also give better access to local facilities and public transport links than development away from the urban edge.

5.7.79 Any further growth would need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within the sewerage network. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water. Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels. If detrimental consequences to the water environment are likely, then agreed mitigation measures would be necessary. All development should incorporate strong measures to increase water efficiency and to reduce water use.

5.7.80 Areas of flood risk are mainly associated with the River Avon and tributaries. The best flood risk option for surface water management should be established as part of an FRA. This should include identifying appropriate space for SuDS. Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management. Surface Water Management Strategies may be required for all potential sites. Inappropriate development should be located away from areas of flood risk if mitigation measures are not possible/practical/viable.

5.7.81 Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use, with improved public transport services, walking and cycling routes linking with the town centre. Provision of new distributor roads may be needed for these developments but increasing accessibility through improvements to the road network is likely to increase car use. Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the car and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes.

5.7.82 All development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential in both options to provide renewable forms of energy and heat on site, and to link in with adjoining residential/employment areas.

5.7.83 Careful consideration of design standards and location of development are required to avoid adverse impacts on listed buildings and the Conservation Areas, and their
setting. Development should be in keeping with existing urban form and respect the rural character of the area.

5.7.84 Any development should be sensitive to the rural character of areas on the edge of Chippenham. Any development on the NE site should be in keeping with the adjacent residential area and rural setting. Consideration should also be given to impacts on the Special Landscape Areas to the south west and south east. More detailed landscape assessments will be required to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.7.85 Options 1 and 2 both distribute development on a number of sites which could mean there are fewer environmental impacts as there are opportunities to avoid development in proximity to sensitive environmental receptors. The more dispersed nature of these new options will allow adverse impacts to be reduced as development is not concentrated in one place. There will be a more localised impact of development distributed over several areas of the highway network, although perhaps reduced scope to deal with highway capacity issues in a coherent manner and to deal with significant infrastructure requirements.

5.7.86 Both options propose development on brownfield sites that are close to the town centre and will benefit from proximity to public transport hubs and a concentration of services and facilities.

5.7.87 There are no absolute constraints to development at any of the sites and because both options score similarly in the sustainability appraisal, it is very difficult to recommend a favourable option. The areas of most concern include transport impacts and impacts on areas that include the River Avon and meadows, Birds Marsh Wood and the town centre and Rowden Conservation Areas. Development proposals that have the least impacts on these sensitive areas, as well as proposing significant additional measures to reduce other sustainability concerns, will likely be the most favourable way forward.

5.7.88 The sustainability appraisal will require updating when further details are available for strategic sites, including and importantly, specific details of the levels of sustainability being incorporated into developments, details of specific transport improvements and details of environmental mitigation measures.

**Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Chippenham**

5.7.89 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, and the assessment work for new strategic housing options described above, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the Chippenham Community Area. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.
The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill Corner</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Moon</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showell Farm</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of likely significant effects – Hill Corner**

Significant adverse effects on biodiversity likely, including indirect effects on Birds Marsh Wood – a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and priority habitat area. Development likely to increase recreational pressure on this area, as well as increase impacts such as noise and light pollution. No other significant effects considered likely, depending on future uses, design and location of development in relation to Birds Marsh Wood.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Hill Corner**

- Appropriate ecological surveys should be undertaken to determine impacts on existing biodiversity assets, including protected species, priority habitat and Birds Marsh Wood CWS. Mature trees and significantly diverse hedgerows should be retained wherever possible. Measures to reduce impacts of noise and light pollution need serious consideration.

- The issue of recreational pressure on Birds Marsh Wood would need to be resolved, perhaps through limiting access or creating significant GI links that are more convenient for people to use. A sufficient sized buffer zone would also be required.

**Summary of likely significant effects – Hunters Moon**

No significant effects considered likely, either positive or negative. No specific constraints to development in terms of effects on any designated areas.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Hunters Moon**

- No significant adverse effects considered likely at this location, depending on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

**Summary of likely significant effects – Showell Farm**

The size of this proposed employment site means there are likely to be significant benefits for the local economy and employment opportunities. There will also be benefits in terms of improving income levels of local people and reducing social exclusion.
However, this location is remote from Chippenham town centre and the site is not adjacent to the urban area. This is a rural area and impacts relating to traffic, air pollution, noise and light could be significant. This will depend on design, location and types of employment uses. The A350 already experiences major congestion and this development likely to significantly add to this unless dualling is undertaken.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Showell Farm**

Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the car and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes. The effects of transport must also be established through further transport modelling. Potential future dualling of A350 may need to be considered. The effects of noise and light pollution can be reduced through landscaping, tree planting and restricting employment uses on this site.

Any development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. A development of this size has the potential to significantly increase emissions of greenhouse gases.

### Core Policy 6 – Trowbridge Vision Areas of Opportunity

#### What options have been considered?

The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed – Wiltshire Core Strategy to provide policy support to the emerging Trowbridge town centre master plan supporting high quality and sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not provide policy support for a Trowbridge town centre master plan but allow the market to determine the level and location of both housing and employment, and to promote infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.8.3 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of land and soil, poverty and deprivation, community facilities, economy and employment. In all cases, Option 1, implementing the policy as proposed, is likely to have a significant and positive effect. There are no negative effects associated with either Option 1 or Option 2.

5.8.4 The main reason for the effects identified are that the proposed policy would deliver a planned town centre master plan for Trowbridge which is specifically designed to regenerate brownfield sites, deliver high quality and sustainable development, and deliver enhancements to the retail, leisure, service and employment provision within Trowbridge. This would lead to the area becoming more popular for visitors and employers, providing new jobs and making substantial improvements to the area more generally.

5.8.5 Although the effects of Option 2 are more uncertain, an unplanned approach is less likely to deliver the same overall level of enhancement. Any market led regeneration is likely to be on a piecemeal basis with a higher risk of uses being promoted which do not offer the greatest potential to improve the central area of Trowbridge overall.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.8.6 There are no significant negative effects identified for either Option 1 or Option 2.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.8.7 Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option as it provides more opportunity to deliver plan objectives and deliver positive enhancement against several sustainability criteria.

5.9 Core Policy 7 – Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area

5.9.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.
At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.9.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.9.4 For Option 1, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to land and soil, as a large area of greenfield and agricultural land is proposed for development. Significant positive effects are likely for housing, transport, economy and employment. The main reason for the positive effects identified are that the proposed policy would deliver a large urban extension to the south east of Trowbridge that could deliver significant enhancement, including for example: flood attenuation, thus reducing existing flood risk to the settlement; deliver housing to meet local demand and provide a significant increase in affordable housing provision; deliver improvements to the road network, particularly the A350 at Yarnbrook and West Ashton which is an existing source of congestion and provide a green corridor linking the development and the town centre; and also provide for large scale employment growth, which could be phased alongside the delivery of housing.

5.9.5 For Option 2, significant negative effects are likely for economy and employment. This is because a market led approach will be much less likely to deliver the same level of employment growth or job creation or to deliver balanced housing and employment growth using effective phasing.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.9.6 The likely negative impacts on land and soil identified for Option 1 would be difficult to mitigate against, although the merit of any particular option should be considered in relation to all of the SA criteria and be informed by a wider evidence base and other factors. The likely negative effects identified for Option 2 could be mitigated by providing greater certainty over the quantum of employment land needed and develop policies to ensure balanced growth of both housing and employment were delivered.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.9.7 Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option as it provides more opportunity to deliver plan objectives and deliver positive enhancement against several sustainability criteria.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Trowbridge

5.9.8 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the Wiltshire 2026 document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These sites have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.9.9 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford road</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Yarnbrook</td>
<td>56.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of White Horse Business Park</td>
<td>25.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ashton road allocation</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects - Bradford road

5.9.10 One significant adverse effect relating to flood risk. Site is in close proximity to the River Biss and flood zones 2 and 3. No other significant positive or negative effects considered likely.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Bradford road

5.9.11 Development should avoid flood zones 2 and 3. A Surface Water Management Strategy may be required to demonstrate equivalent to greenfield runoff post
development. Appropriate consideration would need to be given to measures to deal with surface water, including use of SuDS.

Summary of likely significant effects - Land north of Yarnbrook

5.9.12 This large site is likely to lead to a number of both adverse and beneficial significant effects. The location does not contain any specific biodiversity, landscape or heritage designations. However, the River Biss is an important and ecologically important area and is in close proximity to this site.

5.9.13 The entire site is greenfield. Future development may lead to significant demand for water and there is potential for pollution of the River Biss during the construction and operational stage. The size of the proposed site is likely to significantly increase impacts on air quality and noise/light in this rural location, as well as emissions of greenhouse gases.

5.9.14 Transport - development in this location will significantly increase traffic on the A350. There are already major issues at West Ashton. The site is remote from Trowbridge town centre, there is little or no infrastructure present, no significant main road frontage and it is divorced from White Horse Business Park by the railway. Public transport connectivity is poor at this location.

5.9.15 This development would, however, have significant long-term economic and social benefits for Trowbridge and the wider area through provision of employment opportunities, supporting local businesses directly and indirectly and allowing opportunities for inward investment. Employment will also help reduce issues of unemployment, social exclusion and deprivation.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land north of Yarnbrook

5.9.16 The River Biss corridor will require strong protection and enhancement with a significant buffer zone required.

5.9.17 It is recommended that Core Strategy policy focuses on developing brownfield sites in other parts of Trowbridge, particularly in the town centre. However, if development is to occur in this location, concentrating development adjacent to White Horse Business Park (with access over the railway) would allow better access to existing services/facilities and public transport services.

5.9.18 Any further growth would need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should aim to meet a high BREEAM score for water efficiency and should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.

5.9.19 Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the car and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes.
Significant investment in road infrastructure would be required, including potential dualling of the A350 and possible requirement for a railway bridge. There is potential for mitigation of climate change impacts at this site. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation.

Summary of likely significant effects – Land west of White Horse Business Park

5.9.20 This is a relatively large greenfield site in agricultural use. Development in this location would lead to significant loss of greenfield land. The size of the site means it is likely to significantly increase impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise/light in this rural location, with adverse impacts on the settlement of North Bradley. Site is remote from the town centre and is not adjacent to the urban area of Trowbridge. There are poor public transport services here and development will significantly increase traffic on the A350 and A363.

5.9.21 Depending on the actual size of employment provision and future uses, significant benefits can be expected through job creation and secondary benefits for other businesses in the area.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land west of White Horse Business Park

5.9.22 Concentrating development adjacent to White Horse Business Park would allow better access to existing services/facilities and public transport services, and would avoid coalescence issues with North Bradley. However, the focus should be on developing the remaining brownfield sites in Trowbridge town centre.

5.9.23 Other mitigation measures similar to that for ‘Land north of Yarnbrook’ with regards reducing impacts on air quality, noise, light and transport, and a particular focus on reducing impacts on North Bradley would be required.

Summary of likely significant effects - West Ashton road allocation

5.9.24 A relatively large site – development would lead to the loss of a significant amount of greenfield land in a slightly isolated location that does not have good access to the town centre or to public transport services. There is likely to be a significant increase in vehicular traffic joining West Ashton Rd, travelling through town or to the A350 - already major congestion issues at West Ashton.

5.9.25 Significant benefits for the local economy through employment opportunities, although there are concerns over congestion issues and the slightly isolated position that doesn’t benefit from any existing employment activity in the immediate area.
Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – West Ashton road allocation

5.9.26 Major investment in road infrastructure would be required at this site, including potential new distributor road if forming part of larger mixed-use development. Strong promotion of (and investment in) public transport and walking/cycling routes linking to the town centre will be required as well as further traffic modelling.

5.10 Core Policy 8 – Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network

5.10.1 The purpose of this policy is to support the delivery of a district low-carbon or renewable energy/ heat network in Trowbridge Town Centre.

What options have been considered?

5.10.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy supporting the principle of a district energy/ heat network in Trowbridge included within the Wiltshire Core Strategy. This would also identify any key development sites and safeguard any land critical for the schemes delivery (for example for heat pipes). Supporting details outlined in subsequent Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy supporting the principle of a district energy/ heat network in Trowbridge not included in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, but included within subsequent Development Plan Document (DPD) or Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Trowbridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail to incorporate Core Strategy policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.10.4 None. This is a very locally specific policy and no significant effects are considered likely.

5.10.5 Positive effects – Options 1 and 2 will have a number of limited benefits, including the likelihood that most development would take place on previously developed sites, local improvements in air quality and some limited reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. There may also be health/wellbeing benefits from air quality improvements and potential reductions in energy bills, and economic benefits in terms of local jobs.

5.10.6 Adverse effects – there may be some very localised and limited impacts on groundwater and surface water, including the River Biss, and potential for some development in areas of flood risk. These effects cannot be determined now; it will depend on the type, size and location of any development which is not currently known.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.10.7 No significant adverse effects envisaged. However, there must be consideration of protecting and enhancing biodiversity within areas covered by this scheme and appropriate ecological assessment carried out. Any development would need to be assessed for impacts on ground and surface water and should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses.

5.10.8 To significantly reduce impacts on air quality and climate, a far more radical approach is needed with policies for district energy/heat networks right across Wiltshire, in new and existing developments, including strong policies for renewable energy provision, energy efficiency improvements in all new and existing buildings and significant investment in sustainable transport networks.

5.10.9 Proposals should avoid adversely affecting any heritage assets within Trowbridge town centre.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.10.10 Options 1 and 2 are most favourable because they are supporting the principle of a district energy/heat network in Trowbridge, whereas Option 3 is not. Options 1 and 2 will give some limited, localised benefits but not considered significant in terms of reducing Wiltshire’s overall contribution towards global climate change.
5.11 Core Policy 9 – Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area

5.11.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.11.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

| Biodiversity | 1 | Land and soil | 2 | Waste | 3 | Water | 4 | Flood risk | 5 | Air quality | 6 | Climates | 7 | Heritage | 8 | Landscapes | 9 | Housing | 10 | Health | 11 | Inclusion | 12 | Community | 13 | Education | 14 | Transport | 15 | Economy | 16 | Employment | 17 |
|--------------|---|---------------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-----------|---|------------|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|---|--------|---|--------|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|---|----------|
| Option 1     | -/?| - | + | 0/? | -/? | -/? | -/? | -/? | - | ++ | +/? | + | + | + | - | + | + | + | + |
| Option 2     | -/?| - | - | 0/? | -/? | -/? | -/? | -/? | - | ++ | ? | - | - | + | - | - | + | + | + |

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.11.4 Significant adverse effects possible with regards bats as discussed below. Also, the level of housing proposed and requirement for 40% affordable housing will have significant benefits against the housing objective No. 10. Proposed development at Kingston Farm is on a Greenfield site and there are potential impacts on the nearby Conservation Area, The Hall and its setting.

5.11.5 The potential for physical damage to sites and supporting habitats caused by the Draft Core Strategy is an issue where bats are the qualifying feature and while it is not addressed in the thematic policies it is considered in relevant Community Areas.

5.11.6 There are specific issues with development in Bradford on Avon in relation to impacts on the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC). These issues were identified in the 2009 Sustainability Appraisal Report and HRA Report.
The preferred allocation for the town is a Greenfield site adjacent to a greater horseshoe transition / hibernation roost. The majority of impacts in this area will probably come through cumulative effects of multiple small scale developments and it is possible that these cumulative effects will be addressed through a developers guidance document and project level AA.

5.11.7 The HRA Report states that issues associated with such sites are capable of being assessed and resolved through the provision and implementation of design guidance. Guidance is being prepared jointly by Natural England and Wiltshire Council and a Biodiversity SPD is planned that will cover design guidance for bats. AA is already taking place at the project level for development near Corsham.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.11.8 The location and design of any development will need to be particularly sensitive to landscape and heritage designations with specific investment in sustainable transport modes that help mitigate the expected increase in traffic volumes from development at Kingston Farm.

5.11.9 Impacts relating to bats – it is likely that some development will give rise to project level AA and forthcoming design guidance for bats should provide information on reducing adverse effects.

5.11.10 Adverse effects would need to be avoided or minimised and this may restrict development on the Kingston Farm site. Specific measures should be taken to protect habitats of protected and notable species, especially bats at this location, and extensive ecological survey work undertaken in order to incorporate mitigation for impacts on bats.

5.11.11 The 2009 HRA Report gave examples of how effects can be avoided through design which include:

- mapping flight lines
- location and design of lighting
- provision of road crossings on key flight lines
- identification and protection of habitats used in the summer, e.g. veteran trees/old buildings
- retention/enhancement of linkages/corridors
- provision of new foraging sites for use in the winter.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.11.12 Option 1 is marginally the most sustainable option. Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to developments to
come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised. Effects would very much depend on where development is located, the type of development and mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

Appraisal of potential strategic housing sites in Bradford on Avon

5.11.13 A number of additional potential strategic housing sites have been outlined in section 4.4. The following additional site has been proposed for housing in Bradford on Avon and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of that site is presented below. The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix G.

### Potential strategic housing site – Bradford on Avon

**Land north of Holt road**

**Likely significant positive effects of the options and further enhancement measures**

**Housing**

5.11.14 The alternative option being considered at Bradford on Avon is capable of accommodating the identified housing need for the town, including a range of sizes, types and tenures. This is likely to offer significant benefits, particularly in meeting affordable housing need in a town where average house prices are historically well above many other parts of Wiltshire.

5.11.15 In order to increase benefits, and improve levels of sustainability against other objectives in this assessment, any housing development should be of a high design standard that reduces impacts on the surrounding landscape which is rural in nature. The Woolley conservation area is adjacent to this site and new development should be in keeping with the existing urban form. Any potential adverse effects could be mitigated by locating development in the southern part of this site. The developer submission does not acknowledge the proximity of the conservation area or provide details of potential mitigation.

5.11.16 Housing development should incorporate high levels of energy efficiency that will reduce impacts on climate change. Due to the location of this site away from the town centre, significant investment should be made in providing sustainable transport links with the town centre and other key services and facilities. Housing development, through careful design and layout, should also incorporate measures to reduce waste, reduce per capita water consumption and include other adaptation measures to effectively deal with the predicted future consequences of climate change.

**Employment**

5.11.17 This site is large enough to accommodate mixed-use development which includes land for employment. This can help retain skills within the town, reduce out-
commuting (a key issue) and allow local businesses to expand. There are concerns over the accessibility of this site, with potential access onto Woolley St and Cemetery Lane which might restrict employment uses. Employment may be better situated on the southern part of this site to allow easier access onto Holt Rd. B3107, reducing the need to use inappropriate local roads and avoid travel through residential areas.

**Likely significant negative effects of the options and potential mitigation measures**

5.11.18 No significant negative effects have been recorded in the assessment of this option.

5.11.19 A number of minor negative effects have been recorded, mainly against the environmental objectives. The sustainability assessment findings against these objectives could be significantly improved if proposed development was incorporating a range of measures to embed sustainability, including energy efficiency, renewable and low carbon energy and heat generation and measures to reduce waste and water use; in effect, achieving a high CSH rating. No details are known at this stage.

**Summary of options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire 2026</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Holt</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

5.11.20 The sustainability appraisal has carried out an assessment of a new alternative strategic option for Bradford on Avon, and compared the findings with the findings of the sustainability appraisal of the preferred strategic option included in Wiltshire 2026. At this stage, the assessment concludes that the Moulton estate site performs better against the range of sustainability objectives, and therefore should remain as the preferred strategic option for Bradford on Avon. Further details of any development proposed on land north of Holt road are required before this assessment can be re-visited.
5.11.21 There are particular concerns with the site to the north of Holt Road in terms of public transport accessibility, given its location further from the town centre than other options considered, and accessibility in general with Woolley St and Cemetery Lane inappropriate for increases in traffic levels. The proximity of this site to Woolley Conservation Area has not been addressed at this stage, and additional information regarding design and layout may ease concerns.

5.12 **Core Policy 10 – Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area**

5.12.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

**At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?**

5.12.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.12.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.12.4 The significant effects stated in the assessment in Appendix F and summarised above relate mainly to the amount of new housing proposed. Much of this development is likely to be on Greenfield land as there is insufficient brownfield land in the community area to cater for 1380 new homes.
5.12.5 Both options would lead to significant benefits for housing provision and for the local economy. However, the amount of employment land proposed may not be sufficient to increase self-containment and reduce out-commuting, considering level of proposed housing.

5.12.6 Both options likely to significantly increase traffic volumes and need to travel. Option 2, which may involve Sporadic, uncontrolled growth could have a significant negative impact on rural landscapes and could also adversely affect regeneration in Calne town centre.

5.12.7 The contrast is really at the heart of what spatial planning is all about; the idea that a planned approach can better achieve a sustainable outcome as energies are focussed at delivering wider and longer term social and environmental benefits, rather than at profits and short term gains.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.12.8 The location and design of any development will need to be particularly sensitive to rural character and local landscape characteristics with specific investment in sustainable transport modes that help mitigate the expected increase in traffic volumes from development.

5.12.9 Where possible, to avoid loss of Greenfield land and best and most versatile agricultural land, development should be prioritised on brownfield sites that are in close proximity to Calne town centre. Where this is not possible and need for new housing needs to be met, housing should be built at maximum viable densities.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.12.10 Option 1 is marginally the most sustainable option. Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to developments to come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised. Effects would very much depend on where development is located, the type of development and mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

**Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Calne**

5.12.11 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.12.12 The following site has been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of that site is presented below (further information regarding
this site is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land east of Beversbrook Farm &amp; Porte marsh Industrial Estate</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects

5.12.13 No significant effects are predicted. The size of site proposed is relatively small and there could be strong links with the existing industrial estate. The location of the site is remote from Calne town centre – it is therefore likely that private car use will increase in this area and investment in sustainable transport links should be in place to improve bus services and walking/cycling routes.

5.12.14 This is a Greenfield site and although there are no specific biodiversity or landscape designations at this location, impacts are possible on rural character and protected species. Measures to reduce and/or avoid such impacts should be agreed before any development takes place.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects

5.12.15 No significant adverse effects considered likely at this location, depending on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

5.13 Core Policy 11 – Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area

5.13.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.13.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.13.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
### What significant effects are envisaged?

5.13.4 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of Biodiversity, housing and economic development. Both options propose significant levels of housing development which can also benefit the local economy. There are specific issues in relation to impacts on bats discussed later in this section.

5.13.5 The potential for physical damage to sites and supporting habitats caused by the Draft Core Strategy is an issue where bats are the qualifying feature and while it is not addressed in the thematic policies it is considered in relevant Community Areas.

5.13.6 There are specific issues with development in Corsham in relation to impacts on the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Development in the Corsham CA is also likely to trigger project level AAs, particularly for ex-MoD sites on the west of the town as these are sold off for development. These issues were identified in the 2009 Sustainability Appraisal Report and HRA Report. The majority of impacts in this area will probably come through cumulative effects of multiple small scale developments and it is possible that these cumulative effects will be addressed through a developers guidance document and project level AA.

5.13.7 The HRA Report states that issues associated with such sites are capable of being assessed and resolved through the provision and implementation of design guidance. Guidance is being prepared jointly by Natural England and Wiltshire Council and a Biodiversity SPD is planned that will cover design guidance for bats. AA is already taking place at the project level for development near Corsham.

### What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.13.8 Impacts relating to bats – it is likely that some development will give rise to project level AA and forthcoming design guidance for bats should provide information on reducing adverse effects.

5.13.9 Effects would need to be avoided or minimised and this may restrict future uses on some sites in Corsham. Specific measures should be taken to protect habitats of
protected and notable species, especially bats at this location, and extensive ecological survey work undertaken in order to incorporate mitigation for impacts on bats.

5.13.10 The 2009 HRA Report gave examples of how effects can be avoided through design which include:

- mapping flight lines
- location and design of lighting
- provision of road crossings on key flight lines
- identification and protection of habitats used in the summer, e.g. veteran trees/old buildings
- retention/enhancement of linkages/corridors
- provision of new foraging sites for use in the winter.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.13.11 Option 1 is marginally the most sustainable option. Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to developments to come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised. Effects would very much depend on where development is located, the type of development and mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

**Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Corsham**

5.13.12 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy. These sites have been subject to sustainability appraisal and the full assessment is presented in Appendix H.

5.13.13 For Corsham, the following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land east of Leafield Industrial Estate</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Rear of Fiveways</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of likely significant effects – Land east of Leafield Industrial Estate**

5.13.14 No significant effects considered likely, either positive or negative. No specific constraints to development in terms of effects on any designated areas.
Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land east of Leafield Industrial Estate

5.13.15 No significant adverse effects considered likely at this location, depending on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

Summary of likely significant effects - Land rear of Fiveways

5.13.16 There is a potential significant effect in terms of impacts on the nearby Bath and Bradford on Avon bats SAC and Box mine SSSI located to the south west. There is a need to maintain and enhance major flight lines and there are constraints re lighting, noise and vibration resulting from this.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land rear of Fiveways

5.13.17 Effects would need to be avoided or minimised and this may restrict employment uses on this site. Specific measures should be taken to protect habitats of protected and notable species, especially bats at this location, and extensive ecological survey work undertaken in order to incorporate mitigation for impacts on bats.

5.13.18 The 2009 HRA Report gave examples of how effects can be avoided through design which include:

- mapping flight lines
- location and design of lighting
- provision of road crossings on key flight lines
- identification and protection of habitats used in the summer, e.g. veteran trees/old buildings
- retention/enhancement of linkages/corridors
- provision of new foraging sites for use in the winter.

5.14 Core Policy 12 – Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area

5.14.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.14.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Restrict development of all types, especially in the town centre in order to match traffic generation to capacity of road network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.14.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-- /?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-- /?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>--/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.14.4 Significant adverse effects are likely through implementation of all three options in the areas of land and soil, climatic factors and landscape impacts. All options provide for a significant amount of new housing; much is likely to be located on Greenfield sites. Option 3, by restricting development in the town centre may intensify pressure on rural landscapes and soils. Proposals for 2150 new homes in the CA will significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and transport and growth on scale proposed could significantly impact on the AONB through all options. Issues with development at land between A361 and Horton Rd affecting the AONB have been highlighted in the SA/SEA through analysis of the strategic site.

5.14.5 Options 1 and 2 will both significantly affect air quality in Devizes. The Core Strategy has highlighted that traffic congestion has led to several Air Quality Management Areas being declared in Devizes. Measures to improve air quality in Devizes need to be considered and could be seen as a constraint to further growth in the short term. Options 1 and 2 will also significantly increase traffic volumes through Devizes.

5.14.6 Options 1 and 2 will have significant benefits in terms of housing provision and economic/employment opportunities. Option 3 is more restrictive and would be unlikely to provide the same level of benefits for the community area.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.14.7 The significant adverse effects noted could be significantly reduced by reducing overall numbers of new homes built in the community area. This would have the effect of reducing environmental impacts, particularly relating to landscape concerns, reducing impacts on air quality and climatic factors and reducing traffic volumes.

5.14.8 If reducing overall numbers of new homes is not pursued, significant adverse effects can be reduced by introducing effective measures to reduce energy use, particularly in the home, and increasing the energy efficiency of new buildings. Development should be focused on remaining brownfield sites wherever possible and at maximum viable densities to avoid greenfield uptake.

5.14.9 Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on the AONB or where it would significantly impact upon rural character. Good quality design is required that reflects local character and reduces impacts on the AONB. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.

5.14.10 The Core Strategy refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the need for a traffic demand management solution to road network capacity problems. An increase in new housing and employment will increase traffic volumes in Devizes and effective measures must be established to deal with this.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.14.11 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally difficult to mitigate. Option 3 contains a few short term benefits but these are outweighed by negative impacts, especially in economic, climate and community terms.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Devizes

5.14.12 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the Wiltshire 2026 document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.14.13 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land between A361 &amp; Horton Road</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the west of Hopton Park</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of likely significant effects - Land between A361 & Horton Road**

5.14.14 Development at this site is likely to significantly affect landscape character and potential to affect the setting of the AONB. The location of the site on the edge of the town facing towards the AONB creates the potential for impacts upon the local landscape character and setting of the national designation.

5.14.15 Significant benefits likely in terms of employment provision and local economy.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land between A361 & Horton Road**

5.14.16 Sensitive landscaping, limiting building heights, materials and pallete, particularly around the more visible northern and eastern edges of the development will be required and sensitive landscaping / screening alongside the Public Right of Way.

**Summary of likely significant effects - Land to the west of Hopton Park**

5.14.17 Development at this site is likely to significantly affect landscape character and potential to affect the setting of the AONB. The location of the site on the edge of the town facing towards the AONB creates the potential for impacts upon the local landscape character and setting of the national designation.

5.14.18 Significant benefits likely in terms of employment provision and local economy.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land to the west of Hopton Park**

5.14.19 Sensitive landscaping, limiting building heights, materials and pallete, particularly around the more visible northern and eastern edges of the development. Sensitive landscaping / screening alongside the Public Right of Way.

**5.15 Core Policy 13 – Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area**

5.15.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.15.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.15.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Biodiversity | Land and soil | Waste | Water | Flood risk | Air quality | Climatic | Heritage | Landscapes | Housing | Health | Inclusion | Community | Education | Transport | Economy | Employment |
|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|-----------|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Option 1     | 0/?           | +/?   | 0/?   | -/?       | 0/?         | 0/?      | +/?      | +/-       | +/?     | +/-    | +/-       | +/-       | +/-       | +/-       | +/-    |
| Option 2     | -/?           | -/?   | 0/?   | -/?       | -/?         | -/-      | +/-      | -/-       | -/-     | -/-    | -/-       | -/-       | -/-       | -/-       | +/-    |

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.15.4 Significant effects can be expected in the area of rural and urban landscapes through Option 2. No other significant effects anticipated.

5.15.5 The significance of effects of this level of housing growth in Malmesbury will be better assessed when details of housing sites are known. The Core Strategy does not allocate any strategic housing sites. Housing growth may impact upon biodiversity, landscapes and the historic environment, and there may be impacts concerning flood risk, but this will very much depend on the location and type of development proposed.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.15.6 Development in any location must respect the local character of the area where development is taking place. Malmesbury has a high quality historic environment with few opportunities to bring forward development on previously developed land. It is possible that a greenfield site will need to be identified towards the latter half of the plan period and this should not lead to adverse landscape or heritage impacts that will damage the setting and economy of the town.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.15.7 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally
difficult to mitigate. Option 3 contains a few short term benefits but these are outweighed by negative impacts, especially in economic, climate and community terms.

**Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Malmesbury**

5.15.8 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites were proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.15.9 The following site was proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of that site is presented below (further information regarding this site is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at the Garden Centre</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of likely significant effects**

5.15.10 No significant adverse effects considered likely at this location, depending on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects**

5.15.11 No significant effects considered likely, either positive or negative. No specific constraints to development in terms of effects on any designated areas.

**5.16 Core Policy 14 – Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area**

5.16.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

**At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?**

5.16.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.16.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>- /?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.16.4 The assessment has not noted any likely significant effects as a result of the proposed policy or alternative option. A modest level of growth is proposed, taking account of Marlborough’s location within the AONB and other environmental constraints. Any future adverse effects will depend mainly on the type of any development proposed and the location. At this stage, given the level of detail contained in Policy14 there are many uncertainties about specific effects.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.16.5 No significant adverse effects are noted. Given Marlborough’s location, adverse impacts are most likely to relate to the AONB, River Kennet, effects on the historic environment and traffic through the town. Careful consideration will need to be given to any of these potential effects when deciding on the type and location of any development.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.16.6 Option 1 is marginally the most sustainable option. Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to developments to come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised.

5.17 Core Policy 15 – Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area

5.17.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.
At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.17.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.17.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/-?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/-?</td>
<td>-/-?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/-?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.17.4 Significant effects relate to the level of housing proposed in Melksham. The likelihood is that much of this will be located on Greenfield land and this level of housing provision will have significant adverse effects on traffic volumes and increase the need to travel. Both options are likely to have significant benefits in terms of housing provision and local economy and employment.

5.17.5 No strategic housing allocation in Melksham so other effects are difficult to clarify at this stage.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.17.6 Development should be prioritised on brownfield land where possible and built at maximum viable densities. Investment should be made in sustainable forms of transport to effectively reduce impacts of increased traffic volumes.
What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.17.7 Option 1 is marginally the most sustainable option. Option 2 does not encourage a sustainable form of development but rather would leave it up to developments to come forward as and when. This may not result in developments being located in areas where adverse impacts are minimised.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Melksham

5.17.8 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.17.9 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Berryfield</td>
<td>21.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South of A365/North of Bowerhill</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects - Land at Berryfield

5.17.19 This is a large greenfield site, the majority of which is Grade I agricultural land and much of this will be lost through development. The site is remote from Melksham town centre, is not adjacent to Melksham urban area and does not have good access to local facilities, public transport links and key infrastructure.

5.17.11 The location of this site is likely to lead to significant impacts on air quality and noise/light in this rural location. Transport impacts on local roads, particularly the A350 and Semington Rd, will be exacerbated because of the location of the site and its size.

5.17.12 Depending on the actual size of employment provision and future uses, significant benefits can be expected through job creation and secondary benefits for other businesses, benefiting not just the local economy but the economy further afield.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land at Berryfield

5.17.13 This size development is not recommended in this location. Locating development adjacent to Melksham urban area would give better access to local facilities and
public transport links than a more remote development site such as this. Grade I agricultural land should be avoided wherever possible.

5.17.14 Innovative sustainable transport schemes would be essential to reduce impacts of road vehicles and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes. The effects of noise and light pollution could be reduced through landscaping, tree planting and restricting employment uses on this site and the size of site means that there is potential for mitigation of climate change impacts. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation.

**Summary of likely significant effects - Land South of A365/North of Bowerhill**

5.17.15 No significant effects envisaged. This is a relatively small site with potential minor impacts associated with development of a greenfield site and benefits for the local economy through employment opportunities.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land South of A365/North of Bowerhill**

5.17.16 No significant effects considered likely, either positive or negative. No specific constraints to development in terms of effects on any designated areas.

**5.18 Core Policy 16 – Pewsey Community Area**

5.18.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

**At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?**

5.18.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.18.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.15.4 No significant effects are envisaged in Pewsey community area through either option. The scale of development proposed throughout the community area is at a modest level and over a long time period. Option 1 is more likely to provide benefits if development is focused in existing centres with environmental, social and economic benefits.

5.15.5 The main reason for this is that development that is focussed on the main urban areas (Option 1), and controlled in extent, would be generally less likely to impact negatively on sensitive rural landscapes and local built environment character, and could, if concentrated enough and well controlled by other policies, enable revitalisation and help fund needed infrastructure.

5.15.6 The contrast is really at the heart of what spatial planning is all about; the idea that a planned approach can better achieve a sustainable outcome as energies are focussed at delivering wider and longer term social and environmental benefits, rather than at profits and short term gains.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.15.7 No significant adverse effects are envisaged in the Pewsey community area. The significance of effects will most likely depend on the size of any individual development and its location. These effects cannot be determined at this stage with the information available being of a strategic nature.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.15.8 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally difficult to mitigate.
5.18.9 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally difficult to mitigate.

5.19 Core Policy 17 – Tidworth and Ludgershall Community Area

5.19.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.19.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.19.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.19.4 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of Rural and Urban Landscapes, Housing, Transport, Economy and Employment. In all cases Option 1, implementing the policy as proposed is likely to have a significant and positive effect, to implement Option 2 an equally significant and opposite but negative effect, except in the case of housing where the impact is unclear.

5.19.5 The main reason for this is that development that is focussed on the main urban areas (Option 1), would be generally less likely to impact negatively on sensitive rural landscapes and local built environment character, and could, if concentrated enough
and well controlled by other policies, enable re-vitalisation and help fund needed infrastructure.

5.19.6 The contrast is really at the heart of what spatial planning is all about; the idea that a planned approach can better achieve a sustainable outcome as energies are focussed at delivering wider and longer term social and environmental benefits, rather than at profits and short term gains.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.19.7 Option 1 does not generate any significant adverse effects. Option 2’s adverse effects in all the relevant areas could be partially, though not wholly mitigated through:

- Transport: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband).
- Economy: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband).
- Employment: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband).
- Natural and Urban Landscapes: Additional planning policies seek to mitigate impacts on rural areas and to control design in urban ones.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.19.8 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally difficult to mitigate.

**5.20 Core Policy 18 – Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area**

5.20.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

**At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?**

5.20.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the Policy as Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.20.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.20.4 For Option 1, a significant negative effect is likely in relation to land and soil, as a large area of greenfield and agricultural land is proposed for development. Significant positive effects are likely for housing, economy and employment. The main reason for the positive effects identified are that the proposed policy would deliver a large urban extension to the west of Warminster that could deliver significant enhancement, including for example: deliver housing to meet local demand and provide a significant increase in affordable housing provision; and also provide for large scale employment growth, which could be phased alongside the delivery of housing.

5.20.5 For Option 2, significant negative effects are likely for water, economy and employment. Development under Option 2 is likely to result in a more dispersed pattern of growth. This would be less able to deliver coordinated improvements to the existing drainage network which needs upgrading for any development to proceed. Furthermore, addressing the problem of elevated phosphate concentrations from the sewage treatment works discharge is unlikely to be viable for small development sites. A single urban extension provides the best opportunity to ensure this matter is appropriately addressed. A market led approach will be much less likely to deliver the same level of employment growth or job creation or to deliver balanced housing and employment growth using effective phasing.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.20.6 The likely negative impacts on land and soil identified for Option 1 would be difficult to mitigate against, although the merit of any particular option should be considered in relation to all of the SA criteria and be informed by a wider evidence base and other factors. The likely negative effects identified for Option 2, in relation to Economy and Employment could be mitigated by providing greater certainty over the quantum of employment land needed and develop policies to ensure balanced growth of both housing and employment were delivered.
5.20.7 Mitigation for elevated phosphate concentrations in the sewage treatment works discharge will need to be informed by a Phosphates Management Strategy. Policy should ensure that any development cannot proceed until it has been demonstrated that it will not cause a negative impact on the River Avon Special Area of Conservation located downstream from Warminster.

5.20.8 The HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy states that ‘issues relating to potential effects on water quality associated with development in the Warminster Community Area have been addressed by Policies 50 and 51. It can therefore be concluded that the Core Strategy will not give rise to significant adverse effects on the River Avon SAC’.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.20.9 Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option as it provides more opportunity to deliver plan objectives and deliver positive enhancement against several sustainability criteria.

**Appraisal of potential strategic housing sites in Warminster**

5.20.10 A number of additional potential strategic housing sites have been outlined in section 4.4. The following additional site has been proposed for housing in Warminster and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of that site is presented below. The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic housing site – Warminster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land east of the Dene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely significant positive effects of the options and further enhancement measures**

**Housing**

5.20.11 The alternative option being considered at Warminster is predicted to have significant benefits for addressing identified housing needs in the town. No information is currently available on the type of development proposed. However, the size of the two areas under consideration gives considerable scope for providing a wide range of housing types, sizes and tenures, and significant opportunities to provide affordable housing.

5.20.12 In order to increase benefits, and improve levels of sustainability against other objectives in this assessment, any housing development should be of a high design standard that reduces impacts on sensitive surrounding landscapes and incorporates high levels of energy efficiency that will reduce impacts on climate change. Due to the location of these sites, significant investment should be made in providing sustainable transport links with the town centre and other key services and facilities.
Housing development, through careful design and layout, should also incorporate measures to reduce waste, reduce per capita water consumption and include other adaptation measures to effectively deal with the predicted future consequences of climate change.

**Economy/employment**

A mixed-use development with significant levels of housing and employment provision will significantly benefit the local economy, providing modern homes for the local workforce and employment land that will allow inward investment and local businesses to expand.

This option should not be developed solely for housing but provide a range of employment land to meet needs of local businesses. A mixed-use development would also allow a more inclusive community to develop that allows local residents access to a wider range of local services and facilities, thus reducing the need to travel. Development should also help regeneration of Warminster town centre, increasing the viability and vibrancy of the town centre and existing employment areas, not be in competition with it.

**Likely significant negative effects of the options and potential mitigation measures**

**Land and soil resources**

Development within this option will take place on greenfield land, the majority of which is Grade 1 agricultural land. There are few existing opportunities to meet Warminster’s housing needs by developing brownfield sites and therefore development on Greenfield sites will inevitably occur. However, loss of this high quality agricultural land can be reduced through careful design and building at higher density levels.

**Water resources**

There is a known issue regarding elevated phosphate levels in the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) that threatens the integrity of this European designated site. Further development within the river’s catchment is likely to increase phosphate discharges from Warminster sewage treatment works, increasing levels in the river further above agreed conservation limits.

Discussions are continuing with relevant agencies to find a solution to this issue and the HRA process, which is being carried out in tandem with the Core Strategy, will report findings. These findings will be reflected in ongoing sustainability appraisal work.
Climate change

5.20.19 Housing development on the scale proposed is likely to significantly impact on climate change through increased greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions are likely through the construction process, the energy needs of residents and associated travel that will have impacts over the long-term. Effects are particularly significant when considered in combination with other significant development projects in Wiltshire and in neighbouring authorities.

5.20.20 Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency against Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) and BREEAM, with a view to mitigating greenhouse gas emissions. Consideration should be given to meeting the energy and heat needs of the development, and surrounding communities, through on-site renewable and low carbon energy and heat generation, including Combined Heat and Power (CHP). Significant investment will be required to reduce the need to travel by providing key infrastructure and services/facilities within the development, allowing a more inclusive community, and provision of sustainable transport links with the rest of the town.

Summary of options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred option *</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire 2026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>++/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land east of the Dene</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++/-</td>
<td>++/-</td>
<td>++/-</td>
<td>++/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The preferred option contains component parts of Options 2 and 3
Option 2 - Land west of Bath Road and south of Cold Harbour Lane
Option 3 - a series of sites to the south and west of Warminster, including land to the rear of Victoria Road and land at Bugley Barton Farm

Conclusions

5.20.21 The sustainability appraisal has carried out an assessment of a new alternative strategic option for Warminster, and compared the findings with the findings of the sustainability appraisal of the preferred strategic option included in Wiltshire 2026.

5.20.22 Overall, the findings are very similar - the additional site on land east of the Dene does not affect the main findings substantially. It is a greenfield site, a large
proportion of which is Grade 1 agricultural land. It does not have any biodiversity or landscape designations and is entirely within flood zone 1. There is an adjacent conservation area (Bishopstrow) and a landscape character area to the north east which any development would need to be sensitive of in design and location. The site Land East of the Dene is well related to Kingdown School, however other journeys to the north, west and south of Warminster from this site could increase through town traffic.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Warminster

5.20.23 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the *Wiltshire 2026* document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.20.24 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area C Warminster Business Park</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of Bath Road &amp; south of Cold Harbour</td>
<td>36.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD land south of railway</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects - Area C Warminster Business Park

5.20.25 No significant effects considered likely, either positive or negative. This is a very small site adjacent to existing Business Park. No cumulative impacts considered likely. Some concerns over presence of watercourse and area of flood risk near to railway line and views across this site from the east.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Area C Warminster Business Park

5.20.26 No significant adverse effects.

Summary of likely significant effects - Land west of Bath Road & south of Cold Harbour

5.20.27 The size of this proposed employment site means there are likely to be significant benefits for the local economy through employment opportunities. There will also be benefits in terms of improving income levels of local people and reducing social exclusion.
This is a rural area and impacts of traffic, air pollution, noise and light could affect adjacent ancient woodland and meadows. The cumulative impacts of A36 traffic and new development could be significant. This will depend on design, location and types of employment uses.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land west of Bath Road & south of Cold Harbour**

Impacts of air pollution, noise and light pollution should be avoided or reduced on adjacent important wildlife habitats. Development should be located adjacent to the B3414 to reduce impacts. Site is large enough for incorporation of an extensive green infrastructure network and protection of existing natural features.

Core Strategy policy should focus on developing brownfield sites in other parts of Warminster, particularly redundant MoD sites, although it is recognised that brownfield sites are only likely to be able to meet a fraction of the need for housing and employment land. Concentrating development adjacent to Warminster Business Park would allow better access to existing services/ facilities and public transport services.

Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the car and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes. Decisions will be needed on provision of new highway infrastructure if forming part of larger mixed-use development.

**Summary of likely significant effects - MoD land south of railway**

The location of this site is the biggest drawback. It is isolated, beyond the urban edge of Warminster and does not have road access. No significant benefits envisaged.

Significant adverse effects are likely concerning landscape and transport. There is a Special Landscape Area to the north and together with the Conservation Area to the south-east significant effects are likely depending on the type of uses here and design characteristics. Significant increases in traffic are likely due to the location. Public transport connections are poor and considerable investment would be required in new road infrastructure.

**Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – MoD land south of railway**

Development should be designed and located to avoid adverse impacts on surrounding landscape and conservation designations. Mitigation is unlikely to avoid all impacts, however, particularly from surrounding higher ground to the north.

Strong promotion of (and investment in) public transport and walking/cycling routes linking to the town centre will be required, and investment in new road infrastructure as no current road access.
5.21 Core Policy 19 – Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area

5.21.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.21.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.21.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.21.4 Likely significant positive effects are identified for Option 1 in relation to Housing, Economy and Employment. This is because a planned level of housing growth will meet local need and ensure appropriate levels of affordable housing are delivered. The allocation of a strategic employment site will not only provide high quality provision for prospective employers wishing to move into the area, but also facilitate churn of the existing employment sites, which in some case, are in need of improvement.

5.21.5 Likely negative effects are identified for Option 2 relating to Economy and Employment. As the level and location of growth would be determined by the market, it is likely that less employment land would be delivered. This would have a negative impact on the local economy not only because fewer jobs would be created locally, but also because strengthening existing employment spaces would be more difficult.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.21.6 The likely negative effects identified for Option 2, in relation to Economy and Employment could be mitigated by providing greater certainty over the quantum of employment land needed and develop policies to ensure balanced growth of both housing and employment were delivered.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.21.7 Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option as it provides more opportunity to deliver plan objectives and deliver positive enhancement against several sustainability criteria.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Westbury

5.21.8 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the Wiltshire 2026 document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.21.9 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Mill Lane Hawkeridge</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land West of West Wilts Trading Estate</td>
<td>39.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road Allocation</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects - Land at Mill Lane Hawkeridge

5.21.10 The size of this proposed employment site means there are likely to be significant benefits for the local economy and employment opportunities. The site is adjacent to West Wilts Trading Estate and therefore could benefit from infrastructure associated with that existing area.

5.21.11 There are no specific environmental constraints to development. The location is remote from Westbury town centre, however, and the site is not adjacent to the urban area. This is a rural area and impacts of traffic, air pollution, noise and light could be significant. The size of this site means that a significant amount of greenfield land will be lost to development. Further information is required regarding agricultural land classification.
Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land at Mill Lane Hawkeridge

5.21.12 Concentrating development adjacent to the urban area of Westbury would allow better access to existing services/facilities and public transport services. There should be avoidance of grades I and II agricultural land if possible.

5.21.13 Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the motor vehicle and to increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to share energy/heat generation capabilities with adjoining employment area.

5.21.14 Decisions will be needed on provision of new highway infrastructure and linking with West Wilts Trading Estate across Hawkeridge road.

Summary of likely significant effects - Land West of West Wilts Trading Estate

5.21.15 Large proposed employment site. Significant amount of greenfield land will be lost to development. Further information is required regarding agricultural land classification. The location is remote from Westbury town centre and the site is not adjacent to the urban area. This is a rural area and impacts of traffic, air pollution, noise and light could be significant. The site is divorced from West Wilts Trading Estate and Storridge rd – this could create land assembly and access problems.

5.21.16 This site contains a considerable area of flood zones 2 and 3 to the north, east and west which severely restricts amount of developable land. This would prevent development adjacent to West Wilts Trading Estate. There is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) – a medieval settlement - bordering the site to the south. Significant adverse impacts likely – the significance of effects will depend on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

5.21.17 Size of proposed employment area means there are likely to be significant benefits for the local economy, employment opportunities, indirect benefits for many other local businesses and social benefits. The site is in proximity to West Wilts Trading Estate, although divorced, and therefore could benefit from infrastructure associated with that existing area.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land West of West Wilts Trading Estate

5.21.18 Concentrating development adjacent to the urban area of Westbury would allow better access to existing services/facilities and public transport services. Development should avoid flood zones 2 and 3. Adequate buffer zones required to protect watercourses. A Surface Water Management Strategy may be required to demonstrate equivalent to greenfield runoff post development. Appropriate use of
SuDS should be considered and consideration given to adaptation to future impacts of climate change.

5.21.19 Innovative sustainable transport schemes are essential to reduce impacts of the motor vehicle and increase accessibility to the town centre by sustainable transport modes. Development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is potential to share energy/heat generation capabilities with West Wilts Trading Estate.

5.21.20 Any development on this site should protect and enhance the SAM and be sensitive to its setting. Sensitive design and suitable landscaping/buffer required.

Summary of likely significant effects - Station Road Allocation

5.21.21 No significant effects envisaged at this site. The majority of this site is brownfield land and there are no specific environmental constraints to development.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Station Road Allocation

5.21.22 None. Development may need to avoid certain areas in western part of site due to possible flood risk. Review of flood risk required.

5.22 Core Policy 20 – Spatial Strategy: Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area

5.22.1 The Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation document incorporates specific policies for each Community Area which sets out how the strategy applies to that area. This policy includes setting out the draft employment and housing figures for each area.

At this stage, what options have been considered for this community area?

5.22.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the policy as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not set growth according to the hierarchy, but allow the market to determine level and location of both housing and employment, and to provide infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.22.4 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of Rural and Urban Landscapes, Housing, Transport, Economy and Employment. In all cases Option 1, implementing the policy as proposed is likely to have a significant and positive effect, to implement Option 2, either a negative or less positive effect.

5.22.5 The main reason for this is that development that is focussed on the main urban areas (Option 1), would be generally less likely to impact negatively on sensitive rural landscapes and local built environment character, and could, if concentrated enough and well controlled by other policies, enable re-vitalisation and fund infrastructure.

5.22.6 The contrast is really at the heart of what spatial planning is all about; the idea that a planned approach can better achieve a sustainable outcome as energies are focussed at delivering wider and longer term social and environmental benefits, rather than at profits and short term gains.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the significant adverse effects?

5.22.7 Option 1 does not generate any significant adverse effects. Issues that do arise can be dealt with by additional policies and careful development management including the imposition of planning conditions. Option 2’s Adverse effects in all the relevant areas could be partially, though not wholly mitigated through:

- Biodiversity: Additional planning policies, careful development management and developer contributions could help mitigate impacts and even, potentially, enhance biodiversity.
- Flooding: Careful siting (based on flood risk assessments on a site by site basis), design and flood mitigation measures could reduce impacts.
- Transport: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband). Improved junction design and demand management could help mitigate some other impacts.
- Economy: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband).
- Employment: Technology could mitigate some impacts (e.g. super broadband).
Natural and Urban Landscapes: Additional planning policies seek to mitigate impacts on rural areas and to control design in urban ones.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.22.8 Option 1 is the most sustainable option as it contains significantly more positive than negative impacts. Option 2 contains more adverse impacts and these are generally more difficult to mitigate.

Appraisal of potential strategic employment sites in Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

5.22.9 In addition to the strategic housing sites included in the Wiltshire 2026 document, and assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanied that document, a number of new strategic employment sites have been proposed in the community areas that needed to be subject to sustainability appraisal. These have not necessarily been included in the Core Strategy.

5.22.10 The following sites have been proposed for employment use, and a summary of the sustainability appraisal of these sites is presented below (further information regarding these sites is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers). The full sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential strategic employment site</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former St Ivel factory</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the west of Templars Way</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Interface</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of likely significant effects - Former St Ivel factory

5.22.11 Significant economic benefits likely through employment provision. There is potential for significant adverse effects on a listed building in proximity to this site - Wincanton Transport Depot and an adjacent scheduled monument - Post Mill Mound. Significance of effects will depend on location and size of development, design quality and future employment uses.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Former St Ivel factory

5.22.12 The Wincanton Transport Depot should be retained and reused as part of a masterplanning approach within a sensitive setting, including adjacent buildings. Sensitive landscaping to the north east of the site required, closest to Pound Mill Mound. Development at this location may have a positive effect over current condition in the long-term.
Summary of likely significant effects - Land to the west of Templars Way

5.22.13 Significant economic benefits likely through employment provision. No significant adverse effects considered likely at this location. There are no specific environmental constraints to development.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Land to the west of Templars Way

5.22.14 None.

Summary of likely significant effects - Extension to Interface

5.22.15 The site is located within flood zone 2 and this could be a major restriction to development, although previous development at the site may have already provided flood alleviation measures and compensatory flood storage – this requires further investigation.

5.22.16 There will be a range of social and economic benefits but these are not considered significant due to relatively small site.

Potential mitigation measures for significant adverse effects – Extension to Interface

5.22.17 Potentially extensive SuDS may be required. Location within flood zone 2 may prevent new development. Early consultation with the Environment Agency advised as potentially contrary to PPS25.

5.23 Core Policy 21 – Additional employment land

5.23.1 This appraisal will be looking at a number of core policies that aim to meet the Core Strategy key objective of “to provide for long term economic growth”. This will take into account a number of key sustainability issues in Wiltshire which have been described and discussed in the Scoping Report, including:

- the importance of providing an adequate supply of employment and retail land for future development, and protecting existing employment sites
- town centre regeneration in several towns across Wiltshire
- rural diversification
- high levels of out-commuting
- climate change mitigation and adaptation
- dealing with high levels of redundant MoD land.

5.23.2 It is important to consider the government’s objectives for prosperous economies in this appraisal, outlined in PPS4, which include:

- an overarching objective of sustainable economic growth
• building prosperous communities by improving the economic performance of cities, towns, regions, sub-regions and local areas, both urban and rural
• reducing the gap in economic growth rates between regions, promoting regeneration and tackling deprivation
• delivering more sustainable patterns of development, reducing the need to travel, especially by car and responding to climate change
• promoting the vitality and viability of town and other centres as important places for communities
• raising the quality of life and the environment in rural areas by promoting thriving, inclusive and locally distinctive rural communities whilst continuing to protect the open countryside for the benefit of all.

Core Policy 21 part 1 - New employment land (scale)

5.23.3 The purpose of part 1 of this policy is to:

• identify sufficient new employment land to attract new jobs that is suitable for a range of business types, especially target sectors to help diversify the employment base
• locate, promote and expand clusters or networks of knowledge driven or high technology industries.

What options have been considered?

5.23.4 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify specific sites to meet demand anticipated from job projections (55ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify specific new sites to meet demand anticipated from job projections (55ha) with an added element for ‘churn’ in existing stock (DTZ = +76 ha) to be provided within regeneration sites and mixed use urban extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify specific new sites to meet demand anticipated from job projections (55ha) and allow additional land to be released to accommodate relocation from inappropriate premises on a site by site basis against set criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.23.5 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
### What significant effects are envisaged?

#### 5.23.6 Option 1 – no likely significant effects.

#### 5.23.7 Option 2 is considered likely to have significant adverse effects against the sustainability objectives relating to efficient and effective use of land, air quality and environmental pollution and landscapes, and significant positive effects relating to employment:

**Efficient and effective use of land**

#### 5.23.8 This option proposes to allocate a significant additional amount (+76ha) of employment land compared to the other two options, over and above that required to meet job projections, to be provided within regeneration sites and mixed use urban extensions. It does not specify where these areas will be, but due to the relatively small area of brownfield sites (or previously developed land) within Wiltshire’s regeneration areas, and the fact that some of the regeneration areas already have development proposals submitted, it must be assumed that much of this additional employment land will take place on Greenfield urban extensions on the edge of the larger market towns. This will not maximise the efficient use of land within town centres, may risk the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and will likely have a number of other impacts on environmental receptors.

**Air quality and environmental pollution**

#### 5.23.9 The amount of additional employment land proposed, especially if located on Greenfield sites away from town centres, is likely to significantly impact on air quality, noise, light pollution and other types of environmental pollution. This will mainly be in the form of disturbance to existing residents and wildlife, noise related to traffic and industry and effects on air quality mainly from traffic. The severity of any effects will very much depend on location and type of industry and it is acknowledged that there are mitigation measures available to reduce such effects, therefore a score of +/- has been given.
Landscapes

5.23.10 There could be significant landscape impacts, particularly from developing greenfield sites on the edge of market towns. Again this will depend on the location of any such development, type of industry, building design, landscaping etc – such details are not known at this stage and this is the reason for scoring -/-.

Employment

5.23.11 Options 2 and 3 are both likely to provide significant amounts of additional land for employment, compared with Option 1. Both options will allow local businesses to expand and will enhance the vitality and viability of existing employment areas. However, adverse effects have also been noted which will need to be addressed if benefits are to be enhanced.

5.23.12 Option 2 states that additional land will be provided within regeneration sites and mixed use urban extensions. Only a limited number of (mainly larger) market towns have regeneration areas and urban extensions and this means that the smaller towns will have fewer opportunities to attract inward investment and for businesses to expand. Option 3 will allow provision in all market towns but states that additional land will be released to ‘accommodate relocation from inappropriate premises on a site by site basis’. This may benefit existing businesses but what about attracting inward investment over and above the 55ha that meets job projections?

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.23.13 The environmental impacts of these policies can be reduced by restricting development of additional greenfield land and strongly promoting the development and remediation of previously developed sites within all of Wiltshire’s market towns. This could avoid or reduce many of the adverse effects relating to Greenfield development on biodiversity, water, climatic factors, air quality and landscapes that have been discussed in the assessment. Where Greenfield development does take place, ideally this should be as part of mixed use development that reduces the need to travel, has strong sustainable transport links with town centres and avoids any sensitive environmental receptors.

5.23.14 Focussing development on town centre previously developed sites will also boost regeneration and improve the viability of other town centre business and services. It can take advantage of proximity to better public transport services and allow a choice of sustainable transport modes. However, it is also acknowledged that locating some employment uses in town centre locations can actually increase traffic levels and congestion and may not be appropriate in proximity to residential areas.

5.23.15 Many effects regarding air quality, noise, light pollution and odour can be effectively reduced or mitigated through high quality design standards and sensitive location of development that reduce impacts on people and the natural environment. Considering the types of industry that are now established and establishing in
Wiltshire, effects on air quality are more likely to arise from transport and appropriate location can significantly reduce the amount of journeys.

5.23.16 It is recommended that if additional employment land is being considered over and above that to meet demand anticipated from job projections, this is not restricted to regeneration and urban extension sites, but will also provide for smaller communities (not just market towns) that also have a desire to increase their employment base, by attracting new businesses and allowing existing businesses to expand. This includes regenerating existing employment sites, and allowing the expansion of these so that businesses can relocate near to their existing customer base.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.23.17 In terms of significant effects, Option 2 is considered to be more likely to give rise to a greater number of adverse impacts against the environmental objectives. However, this is mainly because it states what additional amount is likely to be provided and it is assumed that much of this will be on Greenfield sites in edge of town locations. Option 3 may well give rise to a similar provision of land in similar locations. These details are not known at this stage and actual effects of development will depend very much on location and types of use.

5.23.18 It is recommended that the eventual policy should be a combination of Options 2 and 3, allowing for additional employment growth that is above anticipated job predictions but that will not restrict this employment growth to regeneration/urban extension sites or relocation from inappropriate premises. Policy should allow all communities to benefit from employment opportunities, allowing existing businesses to expand and attracting new businesses.

Core Policy 21 part 2 - New employment land (location)

5.23.19 Part 2 of Core policy 21 has been developed to find the most sustainable locations for employment land across Wiltshire.

What options have been considered?

5.23.20 The following policy options have been developed (further evidence demonstrating why these options are being considered is contained within the economy topic paper which accompanies the Core Strategy):
Policy option | Description
---|---
1 | Release specific new sites in principle towns for all B class uses ie Chippenham, Trowbridge, (Salisbury)
2 | Release specific new sites in principle towns and named market towns with economic potential ie Chippenham, Trowbridge, (Salisbury), Calne, Devizes, Melksham, Warminster, Westbury, (Amesbury)
3 | Allow release of land in all named market towns in response to specific projects tested against a list of criteria.

5.23.21 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.23.22 Significant adverse effects are most likely to arise through Option 1. All options offer significant benefits for local economies and employment, although Option 1 would restrict such opportunities to Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham. Option 3 is likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of skills retention, training, apprenticeships etc to allow local businesses to prosper and expand across all communities in Wiltshire. Significant effects are further explained below:

**Efficient and effective use of land**

5.23.23 Option 1 would release specific new sites only in the principle towns of Salisbury, Chippenham and Trowbridge. There are not enough town centre brownfield sites to meet all of Wiltshire’s need for new employment land in these three settlements, therefore it could be assumed that much of this need would be met through large Greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area, which may also lead to some loss of best and most versatile land. Options 2 and 3 would be more likely to develop brownfield sites in a number of different market towns across Wiltshire.
Air quality and environmental pollution

5.23.24 All options likely to lead to adverse effects against this objective. However, Option 1 would require large employment sites to meet all of Wiltshire’s need and this would significantly exacerbate traffic related problems and impact on air quality in those three settlements. Town centre locations to meet this level of employment demand are not feasible – proximity to town centres would allow greater sustainable transport choices and may reduce impacts on air quality.

Landscapes

5.23.25 All options likely to lead to adverse effects against this objective, although Options 2 and 3 would likely be less significant due to smaller sites across a wide range of settlements. Option 1 however may have significant landscape impacts for Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham due to the anticipated size of sites required to meet all of Wiltshire’s employment land needs. Effects will very much depend on location, type of development and uses, design and measures taken to reduce impacts.

Education and skills

5.23.26 Option 1 will allow skills retention in the three named settlements but will have a significantly detrimental effect elsewhere. In other areas of Wiltshire, communities will not be able to attract new businesses to the area or enable existing businesses to expand, leading to fewer training and apprenticeship opportunities and losing skilled workers to other areas.

5.23.27 Option 3 however will have significant benefits across all named market towns because land would be made available to allow business expansion and to attract inward investment.

Transport

5.23.28 Option 1 will lead to significantly increased travel from across Wiltshire because fewer employment opportunities will be available in other community areas. People will be forced to travel to Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham, as well as other locations outside Wiltshire for work, and many journeys would be likely to be made by private car.

Economic growth and employment

5.23.29 All options will have significant benefits for employment and economic growth. However, Option 1 is only likely to benefit Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham whilst Option 2 will only release specific sites in towns with economic potential. It is not clear how certain towns are judged to have ‘economic potential’ while others do not. It is also not clear what the ‘specific projects’ and ‘list of criteria’ stated in Option 3 are and what this would involve and further information is required to assess more fully.
5.23.30 It is acknowledged that Options 1 and 2 possibly provide more certainty to the market over where and what type of new land is available, whereas Option 3 is more responsive and market led. However, Options 1 and 2 need to ensure that all communities in Wiltshire can benefit from economic and employment growth, including rural communities.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.23.31 In order to reduce the amount of Greenfield land released for development, there should be a strong emphasis on providing employment sites on brownfield land and within or in close proximity to town centres. It is appreciated that not all future land for employment can be situated in these locations, but the presumption should be that these locations will be developed first.

5.23.32 If Greenfield sites are required, and this is most likely to be the case through Option 1, employment opportunities should be provided in mixed-use, sustainable locations that have good access to existing local services and facilities and public transport links that will reduce the need to travel. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land should also be minimised wherever possible, although the overriding economic benefits may sometimes outweigh this preference.

5.23.33 To reduce impacts on air quality, landscapes and transport, employment land should be provided that benefits all communities across Wiltshire, not just the principle towns. Focusing development in just a small number of towns will significantly increase air pollution, mainly from increases in traffic, and is likely to impact upon landscapes and the natural environment in general (depending on location).

5.23.34 It is considered that the most important way of reducing impacts of these options, and improving the local economy and health and wellbeing, is to allow and provide for employment growth in all of Wiltshire’s communities, not just the principle towns or the market towns, but appreciate that there may be opportunities in smaller communities and in rural areas for employment that will have economic, social and environmental benefits.

5.23.35 There is currently no information available on what the criteria mentioned in the policy wording for Option 3 would consist of. This may have a significant bearing on what type of employment uses or what type of land is made available in smaller communities. Further information would be needed to establish the effects of Option 3.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.23.36 It is likely that a combination of Options 2 and 3 will be required to meet the need for employment land across Wiltshire, which recognises that employment opportunities should not be restricted to certain market towns but will benefit all communities.
These two options were considered unlikely to have any significant adverse effects, in comparison with Option 1 which would lead to many.

5.23.37 It is understood that a policy for releasing land in rural areas has been incorporated into the rural enterprise policy, and this will be subject to sustainability appraisal. However, the policy assessed above could make reference to the importance of allowing employment opportunities in rural areas which help protect and enhance key local services and facilities as well as maintaining quality of life for rural residents and providing opportunities for farm diversification.

5.24 **Core Policy 22 - Existing employment sites**

5.24.1 The purpose of this policy is to:

- protect key employment areas to support existing businesses
- support, promote and expand clusters or networks of knowledge driven or high technology industries.

**What options have been considered?**

5.24.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Protect ‘strategic’ employment sites which are fundamental to the economic role of named towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protect ‘strategic’ employment sites which are fundamental to the economic role of named settlements supported by criteria to determine when smaller sites should be protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Protect all employment sites with criteria to assess their value to the local economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.24.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>++/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.24.4 Significant adverse effects are only considered likely through Option 1. These relate to the following:

Education and skills

5.24.5 Option 1 will promote and be most likely to lead to skills retention only in settlements where there are ‘strategic’ sites and this will have a detrimental long term effect elsewhere where significant numbers of sites could be lost to other uses. If locally important employment sites are lost, businesses may be forced to move elsewhere with consequent loss of skilled workers in the local area.

Transport

5.24.6 Option 1 could lead to loss of many smaller employment sites throughout Wiltshire which would mean people having to travel further to seek work. There would not be the same amount of employment opportunities, particularly in some of the smaller towns, significantly increasing the need to travel for jobs elsewhere in the county or further afield. This would exacerbate current problems of out-commuting to towns along the M4 corridor such as Bristol, Bath and Swindon.

Economic growth and employment

5.24.7 Option 1 would not protect smaller individual sites and could lead to greater pressure to release such sites for other uses. It also does not protect rural employment sites. Smaller sites may not be classed as strategic but they often play a very important role in their community, providing employment opportunities, helping to increase self-containment and allowing other local businesses to remain viable.

Significant positive effects

5.24.8 Option 3 would protect all employment sites and therefore be most likely out of the three options to give opportunities for developing local skills and allowing local businesses to expand. There would be important indirect effects for other local businesses that rely on those businesses and their employees, allowing them to maintain their viability and profitability.

5.24.9 Options 2 and 3 would both be likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of local economies and employment through their additional protection of smaller employment sites. However, Option 2 does not allow for protection of rural sites and this is an area that should be covered by Core Strategy policy.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?
5.24.10 In order to retain existing skills and attract new skilled workers across Wiltshire, policy should allow for protection of smaller sites in all communities, not protect strategic sites only. Smaller sites can often play a vital role in a community, sometimes meeting a niche market and supporting many other local businesses, even though they may not be classed as ‘strategic’. Rural areas also need employment opportunities and protection of rural sites should be strongly considered in policy.

5.24.11 In terms of transport related impacts, if some smaller employment sites were not protected and were to undergo change of use, people would have to travel further to find employment. Much of this additional travel is likely to be by private car as bus and rail services are often poor in many areas of Wiltshire, particularly in rural areas. To reduce or prevent these impacts, smaller sites should be protected from change of use. If this is not possible and the focus is on strategic sites, there should be excellent sustainable transport links between those strategic sites and town centres, other settlements and the strategic road network. This should include frequent and reliable bus services and safe and convenient walking and cycling routes that give people a real choice as to how they travel.

5.24.12 In terms of effects on employment and economic growth, policies must provide for protection of all employment sites that are of value and play an important economic and social role in a community, including those in rural areas. Losing sites to other uses will lead to loss of jobs, skills and subsequent social impacts on the fabric of communities that cannot easily be rectified.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.24.13 The most favourable options are 2 and 3 which have very similar scores. These two options are not considered likely to lead to significant adverse effects and in fact may have significant benefits in terms of opportunities to retain skills.

5.24.14 Option 1 does not allow enough flexibility and will lead to significant impacts that will damage the economic health of local communities.

5.24.15 It is acknowledged in the assessment that it will not always be desirable to protect every employment site in every community.

5.25 Core Policy 23 - Economic regeneration

5.25.1 The purpose of this policy is to:

- promote regeneration of key development sites in market towns
- provide for the appropriate conversions of historic buildings for employment development
• promote re-use of brownfield land, linked to town centre first approach only locating out-of-centre sites where requirements such as size, quality access to markets and workforce take priority.

What options have been considered?

5.25.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify specific regeneration sites in named market towns highlighting principle future uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote regeneration of sites where the proposed uses support the vision for the future role and function of a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify specific regeneration sites only in Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury supported by a generic policy in other areas where proposals support the vision for that area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.25.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.25.4 No significant adverse effects envisaged from any of the three options. Any development, in any location, is likely to have some adverse impacts on objectives relating to air quality and environmental pollution, climatic factors, heritage and landscapes. However, the extent of any impacts will depend on the location of the site, employment uses and design standards. Mitigation measures possible for all potential effects.
5.25.5 Option 2 is the only option where significant positive effects are likely across all communities. Options 1 and 3 are more restrictive and only likely to significantly benefit certain individual areas.

5.25.6 Option 2 is likely to lead to regeneration of more brownfield sites in a greater number of locations, so reducing the need for Greenfield development. This option also likely to give greater economic and employment benefits as it is less restrictive and does not require sites to be identified in the Core Strategy.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.25.7 No significant adverse effects envisaged from any of the options. However, the focus of regeneration of sites should be on town centre locations that can help improve vitality and viability of local businesses and benefit from proximity to public transport interchanges.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.25.8 Option 2 is the only option considered likely to result in significant benefits for all communities because it does not restrict regeneration to certain towns or sites.

5.26 Core Policy 24 – Re-use of military establishments

5.26.1 Given the importance of MoD operations and the nature and location of MoD sites in Wiltshire, it is important that changes to existing facilities and the reuse of redundant facilities are addressed in a timely manner that benefits the surrounding community. This policy seeks to:

- provide MoD certainty about the redevelopment of military sites that will stay in MoD use
- encourage the re-use of redundant military sites and establishments in a sustainable manner.

What options have been considered?

5.26.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide a descriptive policy to encourage the correct uses at existing/redundant military sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allow all proposals for the redevelopment/re-use of existing military sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not allow any development at military sites unless they conform entirely to existing planning policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.26.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>-/? ++</td>
<td>0 + + + - +</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>- + + - - +</td>
<td>+ + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>-- +</td>
<td>0 + + ? - - - ++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>- + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + + + + -</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++ +</td>
<td>++ ++ ++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td>+ - 0</td>
<td>0 + + - + + + + -</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+ + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + + + + +</td>
<td>- + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ + ++ + + + +</td>
<td>++ + + + + +</td>
<td>++ +</td>
<td>++ + +</td>
<td>++ + +</td>
<td>++ + +</td>
<td>++ ++ ++ +</td>
<td>++ ++ + +</td>
<td>++ + + + +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.26.4 Significant effects are considered likely through options 1 and 2.

**Option 1**

5.26.5 This option encourages redevelopment of redundant military sites and buildings but encourages correct uses and ensures that development takes proper account of scale, character and location. It is therefore likely that appropriate development will take place and in locations that are more sustainable and in closer proximity to town centres where public transport services are often better.

5.26.6 Redeveloping sites in appropriate locations will also have significant benefits for Wiltshire’s high value landscapes as proper account is taken of local character and surrounding area, and also that the more remote rural sites are not developed inappropriately.

5.26.7 There are no significant adverse effects likely. However, any development on such redundant sites could adversely affect biodiversity assets, particularly if the site has been redundant for a long time.

**Option 2**

5.26.8 This option will allow all proposals for the redevelopment/re-use of existing military sites and may therefore result in development that is not in keeping with scale, character and location and could lead to inappropriate development at remote rural locations. This could be a particular problem in an area where there is a large number of redundant sites, with cumulative effects on wildlife sites and landscapes.

5.26.9 However, there is potential with this very flexible option of providing a large number of new houses on many different sites and providing much land for employment. This
could significantly benefit the local economy, attract skilled workers and inward investment and support existing businesses that can benefit indirectly.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.26.10 This policy needs to focus on redeveloping those sites that are in the most sustainable locations, are well located to their settlement and will provide the most benefits for local communities. Remote, rural sites will likely encourage unsustainable modes of transport and will have the greatest environmental impacts. Town centre regeneration is a priority in some areas and this policy can help promote this.

5.26.11 All development should protect and enhance existing biodiversity. Appropriate ecological assessment would be required. Sensitive locations such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and ancient woodland require specific protection and mitigation. Significant development should be avoided where it would impact on a national or local landscape designation. All development should be located and designed to respect and be sensitive to local landscape characteristics.

5.26.12 Strong consideration should be given to the type of use that these sites are redeveloped for. This will depend on the location and particular circumstances in the local economy. In some areas housing would give greater benefits and in others certain types of business/employment use would be preferable.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.26.13 Depending on the location, a combination of Options 1 and 2 may be an appropriate way forward. Option 1 may be a bit too descriptive and not result in the same degree of social and economic benefits as Option 2. Option 2, however, is rather too flexible and would result in significant environmental impacts; a policy that requires adherence to local planning policy, respecting the location and local character, but is also flexible enough to consider other sites that may give substantial social and economic benefits, would be preferable.

5.26.14 Option 3 is too restrictive and would not encourage redevelopment of any sites that do not conform entirely, or those sites that require significant remediation.

**5.27 Core Policy 25 - Rural diversification and enterprise**

5.27.1 The purpose of this policy is to:

- Develop a rural diversification policy which recognises local need for employment, including appropriate conversion of rural buildings
Recognise specific requirements of rural enterprise eg farm and equine developments

What options have been considered?

5.27.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Encourage appropriate tourism and employment opportunities in rural areas, each assessed on its individual merits and value to the rural economy. New sites permitted where well related to a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Encourage only tourism and employment uses that consolidate existing sites or re-use existing buildings that are well related to named villages in core strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.27.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.27.4 No significant adverse effects envisaged with either option. The options are promoting some development in rural areas and this is likely to have some adverse effects on objectives relating to air quality and environmental pollution, climatic factors, heritage and landscapes. However, the extent of any impacts will depend on the location of the site, employment uses and design standards. Mitigation measures possible for all potential effects.

5.27.5 Option 1 does not restrict future employment development just to existing sites and buildings but would allow appropriate new development if well related to a settlement. This is likely to have significant long term benefits for local businesses wishing to expand but not wanting to move away from the area. There will also be indirect, secondary benefits for other local businesses such as retail outlets and pubs and other essential services and facilities.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.27.6 No significant adverse effects. However, where development is permitted on Greenfield land, consideration should be given to avoiding or reducing environmental impacts relating to biodiversity, loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, flood risk, heritage assets and landscapes.

5.27.7 Development in rural areas is likely to increase car usage and lorry movements on rural roads and the impacts of this must be considered when locating new development. Investment should be made in sustainable transport modes to reduce the effects of increased traffic and allow access by public transport, walking and cycling wherever possible.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.27.8 Of the two options considered, Option 1 is the most favourable because it recognises that not all new employment opportunities can be located on existing sites or in existing buildings, and it will allow some flexibility that will significantly increase social and economic benefits for rural communities.

5.28 Core Policy 26: Sustainable construction and low-carbon energy

What options have been considered?

5.28.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1             | a) Ensure new development is resilient to likely future rises in temperature, resulting from climate change, through encouraging good design (such as the Tonbridge and Malling example). Detailed guidance and supporting information outlined in subsequent Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).  

b) Set Wiltshire wide standards for sustainable construction (full Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) standards across all nine categories) in line with national timetable for changing Building Regulations to improve the energy performance of buildings (equivalent to the energy component of the CSH). Detailed guidance and supporting information outlined in subsequent Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).  

c) Policy included in Core Strategy seeking to maximise opportunities for delivering decentralised, low-carbon and renewable energy in new developments. A Sustainable Energy Strategy (SES) would be required for all new developments demonstrating how the requirements of the changes to Building Regulations to deliver zero-carbon** development by 2016 (for residential) and 2019 (for non residential) would be delivered. For large (to be defined) scale development, the SES should demonstrate why the development was not zero carbon (if this
was claimed and if to be built prior to 2016 (for residential) or 2019 (for non residential). Detailed guidance and supporting information outlined in subsequent Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

2

a) As for 1a but incorporating minimum design standards.
b) Develop policy to be included in Core Strategy to address sustainable construction. However, do not set any targets and use an encouraging and guiding approach.

3

a) Fail to incorporate Core Strategy policy to address likely future rises in temperatures resulting from climate change, sustainable construction or decentralised, low-carbon and renewable energy in developments.

5.28.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.28.3 Option 1 is proposing the most stringent requirements to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including setting targets for achieving Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM and requiring certain types of adaptation techniques through building design. This will result in a number of benefits for various sustainability objectives but significant benefits against objective 7 as it is the option most likely to result in real reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

5.28.4 Option 3 would fail to address climate change mitigation and adaptation in Core Strategy policy and this would lead to a number of significant adverse effects. However, national changes to Building Regulations will still come into force whether or not there is a policy in the Core Strategy, therefore impacts may still be reduced.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.28.5 Biodiversity and geodiversity – if Core Strategy policy is requiring the most stringent measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, impacts on Wiltshire’s biodiversity and geodiversity are likely to come from global sources. Wiltshire should ensure that sufficient areas of land are protected to allow habitat protection and migration of
species. Providing corridors between different areas will be an important part of adaptation. Also, if additional water abstraction is required because of warmer drier summers, this must not be at the expense of biodiversity. Additional sources for water would need to be explored e.g. new reservoirs.

5.28.6 Not incorporating a policy would mean adequate adaptation measures will not have been prepared to deal with higher intensity rainfall events and this may increase flood risk for existing and future residents. All appropriate adaptation measures should be explored to deal with likely/expected (?) climate change impacts, including risk of flooding.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.28.7 Option 1 is considered the most favourable option against all sustainability objectives and the only one likely to lead to significant benefits. It proposes more stringent requirements than Options 2 or 3 and goes beyond the targets set at national level to come into force over the next few years.

5.29 **Core Policy 27: Standalone renewable energy installations**

5.29.1 This policy seeks to encourage and support, where appropriate, large scale renewable technologies in Wiltshire. It applies to all types of standalone renewable energy, including wind turbines, biomass generators, anaerobic digestion plants, hydropower turbines and ground mounted solar photovoltaic arrays.

**What options have been considered?**

5.29.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy included in Core Strategy which seeks to encourage and support, where appropriate, large scale renewable technologies. Reference made to targets for renewable energy delivery in Wiltshire in line with UK Renewable Energy Strategy. Reference also made to evidence base setting out identified opportunities. Detailed guidance and supporting information outlined in subsequent Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail to incorporate Core Strategy policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.29.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.29.4 Very few significant effects are considered likely. The only significant adverse effect considered likely relates to Option 1 in terms of landscapes. Much of Wiltshire is located in areas of high landscape value and this is recognised in designations including Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB, Cotswolds AONB, North Wessex Downs AONB and a number of locally important landscape areas. Many towns and villages also have conservation areas and highly valued townscape.

5.29.5 The provision of a significant number of new standalone renewable energy installations, particularly wind turbines, could cause many impacts on these landscapes, including changing the appearance of natural landscapes and habitats (albeit with a high degree of human influence).

5.29.6 Overall, Option 1 is likely to lead to many more positive effects against the sustainability objectives, than Option 2. Continuing with ineffective and inconsistent saved policies

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.29.7 Proposals for large scale renewable energy development should ensure that adverse impacts on designated and locally important landscapes are avoided or reduced. The location of such installations will require careful consideration and appropriate location of technologies such as wind turbines will be the most effective way of reducing impacts and reducing conflict with local residents.

5.29.8 For issues concerning impacts such as noise, shadow flicker and odour that can result from some technologies, again the location of such facilities away from residential areas and important areas for biodiversity will be important considerations.

5.29.9 The sustainability appraisal has stated that rather than supporting and encouraging renewable energy proposals as they come forward, a more proactive approach could be taken if the current low levels of renewable energy output in Wiltshire are to be significantly increased. This may involve establishing certain areas where certain
installations may be acceptable and working with partner organisations to achieve results.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.29.10 Although Option 1 is likely to result in the only significant adverse effects of the two options, overall this is the most sustainable option because of the wide-ranging benefits it is likely to have against other sustainability objectives. These benefits include climate change mitigation which can have important indirect benefits for biodiversity, water resources, reducing flood risk, landscapes and human health. Generating more renewable energy will also help increase energy security and allow other forms of energy generation that rely on fossil fuels to be replaced.

5.29.11 Option 2 relies upon saved policies which are inconsistent across Wiltshire and based on outdated evidence. These are not achieving positive results across Wiltshire and this is not the preferred way to continue.

**5.30 Core Policy 28 - Providing affordable homes**

5.30.1 This policy sets out when affordable housing provision will be required and indicates the proportions which will be sought linked to open market housing development. This, together with the new policy approach of enabling development of sustainable communities in the rural areas, aims to provide an increasing proportion of affordable housing to be achieved over the plan period.

**What options have been considered?**

5.30.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain the current policies saved within the extant local plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adopt an ambitious policy approach which seeks a considerable step change in the level of provision across the plan period – prioritising the provision of affordable homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implement a consistent policy approach across Wiltshire, which seeks to secure a level of provision, which enables the delivery of affordable housing alongside other objectives contained within the strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.30.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.30.4 No positive or negative effects have been recorded against any of the environmental objectives. This policy is concerned with the level of provision of affordable housing; the significance of any environmental effects will depend on the location of any development, housing numbers proposed in that location and sustainability of design. Effects concerning location of housing and housing numbers have been assessed through other Core Strategy policies and through the assessment of strategic housing sites.

Option 1

5.30.5 No significant effects are envisaged through Option 1. Retaining current policies saved within extant local plans will continue to achieve a certain level of affordable housing, resulting in mainly social and economic benefits, but these policies are out-of-date and they require different levels of provision across the former district council areas – generally between 35%-50%.

Option 2

5.30.6 Continuing with saved policies will not improve on the current situation and will not achieve the appropriate level of provision in future. Affordability has been highlighted as a key sustainability issue in Wiltshire with average house prices generally above that for the south-west and UK. Existing saved policies do not adequately address this issue and do not result in the level of provision that is needed, particularly in rural areas.

Option 3

5.30.7 This option proposes an ambitious policy approach which seeks a considerable step change in the level of provision across the plan period. It is not known what level of provision would be required and how ambitious this might be – the significance of any effects would depend on the actual level required. However, achieving a considerable step change could have serious viability implications for developers, meaning that housing developments where a higher percentage of affordable provision was required are not viable. Consequently, the affordable housing and market housing elements of the development would both be lost.
5.30.8 The benefits of providing affordable housing to increase social inclusion and allow more people to live in a decent home are acknowledged. Wiltshire is a predominantly rural area, a desirable place to live and has seen large increases in house prices since 2005. However, adopting an overly ambitious approach could lead to under achievement of housing targets and this could exacerbate the affordability issues.

5.30.9 The sustainability appraisal has also noted that requiring a higher level of provision, reducing the viability of some housing schemes, would be likely to result in less funding for other community services and facilities such as healthcare, recreational open space and community centres. This could adversely affect health and wellbeing with secondary impacts on areas such as social inclusion and cohesion.

5.30.10 The significance and type of effects is very much dependent on the required level of provision and the findings of relevant viability assessments that would need to be carried out.

Option 3

5.30.11 This option proposes a more consistent approach which would take account of the findings of viability assessments and would be more likely to achieve desired housing targets as well as a range of other social and economic objectives. This involves a lower level of provision than Option 2 and would be more likely to improve the viability of housing development, meaning that other types of essential social infrastructure could be achieved, thereby increasing the sustainability of communities.

5.30.12 Option 3, through a more balanced approach that increases housing viability for developers, would also allow appropriate provision of a range of market housing to meet the needs of all, including higher-earning households.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.30.13 Affordability is a particular issue in the more rural parts of Wiltshire with some local people finding it extremely difficult to remain in their communities. Provision of affordable housing in rural areas should be a key focus of this policy and a proactive approach should be taken to identify sites and schemes, working with local people to meet their needs. This will help to increase self-containment and increase the viability of local services and facilities. However, proposals for schemes in rural settlements should not be at the expense of the natural environment and should be designed to reflect local character and distinctiveness.

5.30.14 The proposed mix of housing on large strategic sites should reflect the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and achieve a mix of households as well as a mix of tenure and price. For smaller sites, the mix of housing should contribute to the creation of mixed communities having regard to the
proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and the existing mix of housing in the locality.

5.30.15 It will be important that the final policy adopts an appropriate balance – one that achieves an appropriate level of affordable housing but that does not compromise the achievement of other objectives.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.30.16 Option 3 proposes an approach that would be most likely to achieve the right balance of affordable housing and other objectives. This is the preferred option.

**5.31 Core Policy 29 - Meeting housing needs**

5.31.1 The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the type of housing that is needed to meet the needs of today’s households is delivered.

**What options have been considered?**

5.31.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allow housing type and mix to come forward as the market dictates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Set targets for specified housing types on a Wiltshire wide basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mix / type based upon up-to date evidence on an area by area basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.31.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**
5.31.4 None of the options are expected to have a significant negative effect as the policy options do not involve land or development specifically. Most sustainability objectives are not applicable to this policy option and would expect to have a neutral effect. The only areas where differences can be seen between the policy options are the housing and social inclusion sustainability objectives. In relation to social inclusion, both Options 2 and 3 are likely to have benefits from new housing provision – the significance of effects will depend on level of housing and ability to meet community needs.

5.31.5 For the housing policy area option 3 is felt to have the greatest positive effect as the local evidence should deliver the housing needs required at the local level. Option 2 is felt to be less sustainable as option 3 as delivering housing needs on a Wiltshire basis may not deliver the correct house types for a local area. Option 1 is not felt to be sustainable as the market may deliver the house types best for developer profit rather than local community needs.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the significant adverse effects?**

5.31.6 As the policy option involves the delivery of house types with an outcome of a neutral effect with respect to the majority of sustainability objectives mitigation measures are not felt to be appropriate.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.31.7 Option 3 is felt to be the most favourable option in terms of sustainability as it should delivery the house types needed by local communities, rather than delivering house types needed on a more regional (option 2) or profit driven (option 1) basis.

5.32 **Core Policy 30 - Lifetime Homes standards**

5.32.1 This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. No significant amendments have been made to this policy in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and therefore it is not considered necessary to carry out any further appraisal work.

5.32.2 The previous sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix F and a summary of the main findings is given below.

**South Wilts sustainability appraisal summary**

5.32.3 No significant effects envisaged. One adverse effect noted - potential for minor long term adverse effect. Enabling people to stay in their existing homes may mean that people remain in houses considerably larger than required to meet their needs e.g. one or two older people in a four bedroom house. Whilst this is entirely a matter of freedom of choice, it could lead to energy consumption which is high for two people
and the policy may stop moves into smaller accommodation with lower energy demands.

5.32.4 A very specific policy which has a neutral effect on most of the SA Framework objectives. A positive effect is identified for the objectives relating to social inclusion, housing provision and quality of development. The policy will enable people to stay in their own communities and adapt their existing homes with minimal expense compared to adapting a home which does not already incorporate the design features for easy adaptation. Wheelchair access to all homes and disabled parking standards will facilitate accessing a wider range of facilities.

5.32.5 Minor issues are identified which include people staying in larger homes than they might otherwise occupy, leading to energy demand to heat and light “dead” space, elderly residents becoming isolated in villages with infrequent public transport services and a lack of flow onto the market of family sized homes. However it is considered that the benefits of the policy outweigh these issues.

Mitigation/enhancement recommendations

5.32.6 None.

5.33 Core Policy 31 – Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers

5.33.1 The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the gypsy and traveller communities have enough pitches in order to meet their housing needs.

What options have been considered?

5.33.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide the 49 permanent pitches identified in the Wiltshire &amp; Swindon Gypsy and Traveller needs assessment 2006 for the period 2006-2011 and no new transit provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide the 85 permanent pitches identified in the Draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy for the period 2006-2011 and 27 new transit pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide the 85 permanent pitches identified in the Draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy for the period 2006-2011 and 27 new transit pitches then rolled forward for 5 years based on national advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.33.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
### What significant effects are envisaged?

**Option 1**

5.33.4 No significant effects are envisaged as the option tries to address the housing needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. The option however does not at this stage allocate any sites and therefore many of the effects that may occur at this stage of sustainability appraisal are uncertain. However negative effects could be experienced with respect to biodiversity and land and soil. Positive effects can be experienced with respect to housing and inclusion as the policy aims to meet the housing needs of a specific community.

**Option 2**

5.33.5 No significant effects are envisaged as the option tries to address the housing needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community however as the option provides for a greater number of pitches the impacts could be greater. The option however does not at this stage allocate any sites as such and therefore many of the effects that may occur at this stage of sustainability appraisal are uncertain. However negative effects could be experienced with respect to biodiversity and land and soil. Positive effects can be experienced with respect to housing and inclusion as the policy aims to meet the housing needs of a specific community.

**Option 3**

5.33.6 No significant adverse effects envisaged. Significant positive effects are envisaged with respect to the housing and social inclusion sustainability objectives as this option provides for the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches into the future rather than just to 2011. The option however does not at this stage allocate any sites as such and therefore many of the effects that may occur at this stage of sustainability appraisal are uncertain.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.33.7 The environmental impact of the options could be reduced at the site allocation stage by ensuring that any policy addresses potential issues highlighted that at the moment are uncertain. These are with respect to water, flood risk, air quality, climatic, heritage, landscape, community and transport. These factors would need to be mitigated, with respect to all options and cannot be identified until sites are considered. The need for potential mitigation should be highlighted. Until sites are put forward it is difficult to determine the impact on biodiversity and land.

5.33.8 The HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy has recommended that an additional criterion is added relating to the avoidance of locations that might impact on European sites (see HRA Report for further details and justification).

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.33.9 In terms of significant effects, Option 3 is considered to be more likely to give rise to a greater number of adverse impacts against the environmental objectives. However, this is because it delivers more gypsy and traveller pitches and looks to provide sites into the future rather than for a limited period to 2011. As the option provides for a longer time period however it scores positively with respect to housing and social inclusion as its aim meets potential housing need and inclusion to a greater degree than option 1 and 2 which only provided need to 2011.

5.33.10 It is therefore recommended that option 3 should be taken forward as this provides for the needs of a specific community that outweighs a potential negative effect with respect to biodiversity and land/soil. However when allocating sites, mitigation needs to be considered with respect to biodiversity, land/soil, water, flood risk, air quality, climatic, heritage, landscape, community and transport to ensure any proposals achieve high sustainability standards.

5.34 Core Policy 32 – Protection of services and community facilities

5.34.1 This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. No amendments have been made to policy relating to the protection of community facilities and services. However, policy relating to the provision of new community facilities and services (Core Policy 48 of the South Wilts Core Strategy) has not been retained in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Therefore the original assessment has been revisited because not allowing for new services and facilities may affect the assessment. The following amendments have been made:
5.34.2 Wiltshire Core Strategy policy does not provide for new community services and facilities, only the protection of existing facilities. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase. This will adversely affect social inclusion, health and wellbeing and allowing for the improvement of existing services because they may not be able to cope with additional demand. Viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres will also be affected if new services and facilities are not provided for.

5.34.3 The previous sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix F and a summary of the main findings is given below.

**South Wilts sustainability appraisal summary**

5.34.4 Although a predominantly wealthy area, there are still areas of urban and rural deprivation where access to facilities creates social exclusion. This policy sets out a robust framework to protect existing facilities and a clear framework for the provision of new facilities. This policy will have long-term social benefits with more minor positive impacts for transport and climate change through reducing the need to travel.

**Mitigation/enhancement recommendations**

5.34.5 It is not known why policy relating to provision of new services and facilities has been omitted from the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The original South Wilts sustainability appraisal described this policy as setting out a “clear framework for the provision of new facilities”. This cannot be said of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policy should be amended to provide for new services and facilities to cope with future housing and population growth.

5.35 **Core Policy 33 - Biodiversity and geodiversity**

**What options have been considered?**

5.35.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Wilts sustainability objective</th>
<th>Original score</th>
<th>Revised score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social inclusion for all</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve health and well being of population</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy option</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Do nothing.</strong> Do not include any new or revised policy on biodiversity. Save or reuse the existing policies where these are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Spatial approach</strong> – Adopt a spatial approach, mapping out ecologically important assets across the county and applying stronger policies to these areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Improved policy approach</strong> – Create new policy and replace existing policy where necessary. Policy to be worded in a flexible manner that allows the strategic objective <em>‘Protect and enhance our natural environment’</em> to be met without conflicting unavoidably with other strategic objectives or frustrating the planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Aspirational policy approach</strong> – The strictest policy option to achieve the natural environment objective, putting the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity above all other objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.35.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>+++/+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>++/</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

**Option 1**

5.35.3 No significant effects envisaged. However, existing saved policies are shown to give only partial protection to biodiversity and do not actively promote enhancement through development or other means. This will have likely negative effects against many of the environmental objectives and will not help achieve the economic and social objectives.

**Option 2**

5.35.4 No significant effects but positive or neutral effects likely overall. This option relies on up-to-date information and this information being shown on maps. Areas of Wiltshire where up-to-date information is available are likely to receive better protection of
biodiversity than other areas; development proposals in those areas without up-to-date information, and that might not be included on a map, would be more difficult to defend.

Option 3

5.35.5 This option is likely to give benefits across the range of sustainability objectives. No significant adverse effects envisaged but significant benefits relating to:

- protection and enhancement of biodiversity
- improving air quality and minimising other forms of environmental pollution
- protecting and enhancing the character and quality of Wiltshire’s landscapes

5.35.6 There is likely to be improved protection of existing biodiversity assets and more likelihood of habitat creation and enhancement, particularly through new development. This will have indirect benefits for improving the quality of water resources, reducing flood risk, climate change mitigation and adaptation and protecting heritage assets.

5.35.7 There are likely to be significant benefits in terms of air quality and protecting urban and rural landscapes, particularly if linked with an effective, high quality and multifunctional GI network.

5.35.8 This option is most likely to lead to social and economic benefits of all the options considered, but these are not considered significant at this stage. It gives stronger environmental protection but not at the expense of economic growth and therefore housing and employment growth will still take place. However, it is uncertain how the additional restoration and enhancement measures required of developers will affect viability of some development.

Option 4

5.35.9 Option 4 is rigid in its requirement for no damage to county wildlife sites, no loss of BAP habitat or ecological functionality/connectivity and no disturbance to wildlife. This means that this option is strong in environmental terms but conflicts against many of the social and economic objectives. Significant benefits relating to:

- protection and enhancement of biodiversity
- improving air quality and minimising other forms of environmental pollution
- protecting and enhancing the character and quality of Wiltshire’s landscapes
- sustainable use and management of water resources

5.35.10 This option would make it difficult to find available land for housing and employment growth and this would indirectly affect provision of other essential infrastructure and key services/facilities. However, it has been acknowledged that a policy that is strongest in protection of the natural environment may attract more business,
residents and tourists with consequent benefits for the local economy. This would depend on whether enough land could be made available for economic growth.

5.35.11 Less economic growth and less housing/employment may reduce travel need and therefore reduce impacts of road traffic. These impacts are difficult to predict but overall, this option would be less tolerant of economic growth and lead to a steady decline of business development and expansion in Wiltshire.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.35.12 The only option that is considered likely to lead to significant adverse effects is option 4 and that relates to economic growth. It would also adversely affect provision of housing, jobs, infrastructure and other key services/facilities with indirect effects on social inclusion and cohesion.

5.35.13 Option 4 would need to be amended to accept that it will not always be possible to avoid all impacts on biodiversity and wildlife, and that in some locations compensation will be needed for loss or damage. Housing and employment development is always likely to lead to some adverse impacts but many impacts can be effectively mitigated through location, design and use of landscaping and buffer zones.

5.35.14 The sustainability appraisal has recommended that the Core Strategy policy should address the potential impacts of climate change in terms of loss/changes to habitat and effects on species, but also potential benefits to biodiversity from a changing climate. It should also be acknowledged that protection and enhancement of biodiversity can play an important role in mitigating our effects on climate change and adapting to climate change through for example reducing flood risk and provision of new habitat that will help certain species adversely affected by climate change.

5.35.15 In the final Core Strategy policy, the necessity to protect and enhance sites of national and international importance should also be stressed – at present the policy text refers to local sites and then specifically to Salisbury Plain SPA and New Forest SPA. Reference should be made to the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) that is being progressed in conjunction with the Core Strategy – this is a requirement of articles 6(3) and 6(4) of the European Habitats Directive and it has particular reference to this policy.

5.35.16 It is felt that Core Strategy policies relating to biodiversity and GI should provide a clearer position on the provision of alternative green space. The HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy also concludes that:

- policy relating to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) needs to be sharpened – policy needs to make it clear that there is potential for effects on other European sites, not just Salisbury Plain and the New Forest SPA
• the **quantum** and **location** of SANGS that needs to be provided **should be identified somewhere**. The Green Infrastructure Strategy has a key role but the Core Strategy will have more weight. The **characteristics** of sites that quality as SANGS should also be set out

• the provision of SANGS is necessary to be able to demonstrate that the Core Strategy will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites and should therefore be identified as **critical infrastructure**.

5.35.17 The policy or supporting text should stress the important role protection of the natural environment has in promoting health and wellbeing and encouraging healthy outdoor recreation. This policy should show clear links with a GI policy that includes provision of recreational open space and encourages sport, walking and cycling that can reduce many health-related problems. It should also be acknowledged that future economic growth, particularly housing development, is likely to provide much of the funding for future habitat creation and enhancement, and the funding for many multi-functional GI services.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.35.18 Option 3 is considered the most favourable option and is recommended for inclusion in the Core Strategy. Achieving sustainable development is only possible if policies are able to provide environmental, social and economic benefits. This option will not significantly conflict with social and economic objectives in the way option 4 is likely to, and will not inflict an unnecessary burden on developers that may make some developments unviable.

5.35.19 Option 3 provides a strong and proactive approach to biodiversity protection and enhancement that is a significant improvement on existing policies across Wiltshire, but also allows the provision of essential housing, health, community, employment and other social infrastructure that will be essential for maintaining sustainable communities across the county.

5.36 **Core Policy 34 - Landscape**

5.36.1 This policy seeks to protect, conserve and enhance Wiltshire’s distinctive landscape character. The term ‘landscape’ is used to refer to both the built and natural environment in urban, peri-urban and rural areas.

**What options have been considered?**

5.36.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Criteria-based policy to be included in the core strategy seeking to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character. Include reference to the existing Landscape Character Assessments and to landscape setting of towns and villages. Include specific reference to AONB Management Plans, and also refer to the ‘setting’ of AONBs. Include specific reference to the need to protect tranquillity. Do not refer to Green Belt, rural buffers, or best and most versatile agricultural land in the policy. Further work needed to establish whether or not there is sufficient justification to maintain Special Landscape Areas (or parts thereof).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Include a specific policy in the Core Strategy relating to the Green Belt and seeking to protect specific rural buffers. Also mention the need to protect best and most versatile agricultural land. (This would be in addition to a criteria-based landscape policy, as described in option A above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not include a policy on local landscape character in the Core Strategy. Instead rely on saved local plan policies relating to landscape protection in general. Do not include specific reference to AONBs or tranquillity. There is no specific reference to tranquillity in the current Local/District Plans, so this option would mean that there would be no reference to tranquillity in local planning policy (although the West Wiltshire District Plan does include policy C35 on light pollution).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

**Significant positive effects**

5.36.4 Options 1 and 2 promote use of a criteria-based approach and offer significantly stronger protection and enhancement of landscape character than Option 3. They are both likely to lead to significant benefits for biodiversity and protection/enhancement of a range of wildlife habitats. They will also lead to greater protection and enhancement of Wiltshire’s urban and rural landscapes, much of which is subject to national and local landscape designations.
5.36.5 Option 2 would include all the elements of Option 1, but would also include specific protection of best and most versatile agricultural land, rural buffers and green belts. These additional elements may be inconsistent with PPS7 and PPS12 and therefore this option could be argued to be an unreasonable alternative policy. However, as it stands, Option 2 would lead to significant benefits in terms of protecting greenfield land from development, possibly encouraging additional development of brownfield sites, and reducing impacts of coalescence, noise and light pollution on smaller settlements that are located near to growth areas, through protection of rural buffers.

5.36.6 Option 2 is likely to offer much stronger protection of the natural environment and this is reflected in the additional significant effects highlighted against environmental objectives in the assessment.

**Significant negative effects**

5.36.7 The only option likely to lead to significant adverse effects is Option 2. The additional protection given to landscapes, particularly regarding rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural land that is not required by national planning policy may reduce land available for housing and employment growth. This option is possibly too restrictive and may affect housing and employment provision in main growth areas.

5.36.8 PPS7 states that local planning policy should not include “rigid local [landscape] designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas”.

5.36.9 It is important to protect the separate identity and local character of individual settlements and this requirement is included in the decision-aiding criteria within the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. With Option 2, the significance of any effects would depend on to what extent growth was restricted, how this might affect the local economy in the medium-long term and whether appropriate land was available in other locations where coalescence was less of an issue.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.36.10 The significant adverse effects noted, where a policy that is too restrictive may prevent housing and employment growth in certain areas, can be reduced by adopting a policy that attempts to find the correct balance between protecting and enhancing landscape character and allowing growth in appropriate locations. Issues of coalescence can be identified within growth areas and specific local measures put in place to prevent or reduce any impacts.

5.36.11 It may be possible to protect certain rural buffers in certain locations where there is a recognised need. This is unlikely to place significant restrictions on growth.
5.37 Core Policy 35 – Green Infrastructure

5.37.1 The purpose of this policy is to ensure that delivery of a Green Infrastructure (GI) network across Wiltshire is provided and to try and ensure specific strategic GI projects are delivered.

What options have been considered?

5.37.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Include a policy in the core strategy which supports the delivery of a green infrastructure network across Wiltshire. Include mention of specific strategic projects which will be a key element of this network. This policy could be used to support any proposals for green infrastructure provision which are in line with the objectives of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not include a specific overarching green infrastructure policy in the Core Strategy. Do not refer to specific projects such as the Cricklade Country Way or the canal projects in relation to GI. No current policy on Cricklade Country Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.37.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.37.4 Promotion of a GI network will have significant benefits for wildlife and habitat protection and enhancement and a wide range of other benefits including:

- climate change mitigation and adaptation
- recreation, sport and children’s play
- sustainable transport routes
- reducing noise and air pollution
- sustainable drainage, flood storage and urban cooling
relaxation and quiet contemplation
- a wide range of opportunities for engagement and active citizenship
- protection and enhancement of the water environment.

5.37.5 A GI network is integral to the health and quality of life in sustainable communities and provides benefits against most of the objectives promoted in this sustainability appraisal. It delivers a broad range of functions and provides vital socio-economic and cultural benefits which underpin individual and community health and wellbeing.

5.37.6 No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options, however option 1 is felt to have a greater positive effect than option 2. In effect option 2 – do nothing has the potential to create uncertain effects as it will be unknown whether GI will be maintained, provided or enhanced without a policy option. Option 1 which provides for GI and aims to identify specific strategic GI goals should have a greater sustainability outcome.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.37.7 No significant adverse effects are identified.

5.37.8 It is felt that Core Strategy policies relating to biodiversity and GI should provide a clearer position on the provision of alternative green space. The HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy also concludes that:

- policy relating to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) needs to be sharpened – policy needs to make it clear that there is potential for effects on other European sites, not just Salisbury Plain and the New Forest SPA

- the quantum and location of SANGS that needs to be provided should be identified somewhere. The Green Infrastructure Strategy has a key role but the Core Strategy will have more weight. The characteristics of sites that quality as SANGS should also be set out

- the provision of SANGS is necessary to be able to demonstrate that the Core Strategy will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites and should therefore be identified as critical infrastructure.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.37.9 Option 1 is felt to be most favourable as this would ensure protection and enhancement of the GI network.
5.38 Core Policy 36 – Green Infrastructure development management policy

What options have been considered?

5.38.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1             | Include Core Policy 23 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy proposed submission document (July 2009) within the Wiltshire Core Strategy without substantial additions or amendment. This would mean that the South Wiltshire Core Policy would apply across the whole of Wiltshire.  
Save existing policies relating to open space provision in new developments:  
Kennet District Local Plan - HC34 and HC35.  
North Wiltshire Local Plan - CF3.  
Salisbury Local Plan - R2 and R3.  
South Wiltshire Core Strategy - Core Policy 23.  
West Wiltshire Local Plan - LP4, CR3 and GM2 of the West Wiltshire Leisure and Recreation DPD.  
Wiltshire County Council Structure Plan – C10. |
| 2             | Amend the text of Core Policy 23 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy proposed submission document to make it Wiltshire-wide, and include the amended policy in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The most significant amendment would be the inclusion of reference to the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure standards, and this policy would therefore replace local and district plan policies relating to open space provision:  
Kennet District Local Plan - HC34 and HC35.  
North Wiltshire Local Plan - CF3.  
Salisbury Local Plan - R2 and R3.  
South Wiltshire Core Strategy - Core Policy 23.  
West Wiltshire Local Plan - LP4, CR3 and GM2 of the West Wiltshire Leisure and Recreation DPD.  
Wiltshire County Council Structure Plan – C10.  
Wording in SWLP Core Policy 23 relating to N2K sites has been removed as it will be addressed in the Natural Environment Policy Options. |

5.38.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.38.3 No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options; however option 1 is felt to have a greater positive effect than option 2. This is because option 1, as well as covering development management options, is also specific towards the requirements to mitigate against any impact the plan may have on European designated sites as well as the saved local plan policies setting specific standards of greenspace that any developer needs to meet.

5.38.4 Option 2 does not achieve this specifically as there is only reference to the Wiltshire GI standards and is therefore felt to be less sustainable at this stage as the outcome is felt to be uncertain unless specific standards are included within the policy or has weight as material consideration by themselves. With respect to European designated sites this may well be incorporated into the Core Strategy’s biodiversity policy so this element should be checked. However it is also appreciated that a Wiltshire wide policy needs to be developed but it needs to ensure that the detail is provided to ensure it is sustainable.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.38.5 No significant adverse effects are identified. However it is felt that the policy could provide more detail to ensure minimum open space standards are met and ensure that European designated sites are protected, if this has not been dealt with elsewhere in the Core Strategy. In addition option 2 could become more sustainable if more detail is provided with respect to the Wiltshire GI standards and more reference is made to the European designated sites (unless this is within the biodiversity policy).

5.38.6 It is felt that Core Strategy policies relating to biodiversity and GI should provide a clearer position on the provision of alternative green space. The HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy also concludes that:

- policy relating to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) needs to be sharpened – policy needs to make it clear that there is potential for effects on other European sites, not just Salisbury Plain and the New Forest SPA
• the quantum and location of SANGS that needs to be provided should be identified somewhere. The Green Infrastructure Strategy has a key role but the Core Strategy will have more weight. The characteristics of sites that quality as SANGS should also be set out.

• the provision of SANGS is necessary to be able to demonstrate that the Core Strategy will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites and should therefore be identified as critical infrastructure.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.38.7 Option 1 is felt to be more sustainable, especially if Core Policy 23 of the South Wilts Core Strategy was expanded to include all of Wiltshire and its European designated sites. The saved local Plan policies also provide open space standards that provide certainty to delivery. Option 2 refers to the Wiltshire GI standards but it is not clear what these are or what weight they hold in the planning process. Option 2 should also provide more detail with respect to European designated sites if this option is preferred unless dealt with through other policies of Wiltshire Core Strategy.

5.39 Core Policy 37 - Ensuring high quality design and place shaping outcomes

What options have been considered?

5.39.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain the current policies saved within the extant local plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply a consistent policy across the whole of Wiltshire which seeks high-quality design standards in line with best practice and Government planning guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Apply a Wiltshire wide design policy which seeks exemplar levels of design standards – prioritising design quality above other onsite considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.39.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.39.3 No significant effects are envisaged.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.39.4 Little effective mitigation would be possible. Although non planning initiatives such as local waste recycling, collection and minimisation schemes, might have some effect, this is not as efficient as designing out problems at source with the right policies. Financial instruments such as grants might have limited impact they are unlikely to be available in the present economic climate.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.39.5 Option 2 scores significantly higher when measured against the 17 sustainability criteria than the other options. It would provide a consistent policy approach that accords with Government guidance and so would be enforceable. It would deliver realistic and worthwhile improvements in design leading to the specific sustainability benefits highlighted, especially in heritage, economic and employment terms. The market would be given certainty while not burdened with unrealistic costs.

5.40 Core Policy 38 - Ensuring protection of the historic environment

What options have been considered?

5.40.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain the current policies saved within the extant local plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply a uniform policy which seeks to consolidate existing good practice, and to provide a consistent policy approach, across Wiltshire in accord with PPS5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.40.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.40.3 Significant effects can be expected in the areas of Rural and Urban Landscapes and Historic Environment. In both cases Option 2, implementing a new comprehensive policy informed by latest guidance and best practice is likely to have a more positive and significant effect than sticking with option 1, the existing policies of the extant local plans. Important positive effects are also likely in the areas of economy and employment.

5.40.4 The main reason for this is that existing policy is varied and spread over the extant old Local Plans. It is therefore not consistent across the County. Existing Local Plans are also based on PPG15 and not PPS 5 as their underlying National Guidance, and have not benefitted from the latest technical knowledge and experience.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.40.5 Option 1 is inappropriate in the light of the emerging LDF which is set to replace all extant Local Plans. However, some mitigation of the less effective policies (relative to what is possible with Option 2) would be possible by non statutory means. However, the cost implications of this make it an unfeasible choice. Option 2 does not generate any adverse effects.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**
5.40.6 Option 2 contains is the more favourable option as it scores significantly higher in terms of positive impacts on Heritage and landscape and will have these more consistently over a wider area. As heritage is also a key component of tourism, an important part of the Wiltshire economy, Option 2 is also likely to be beneficial to economic and employment interests.

5.40.7 Option 1 is impracticable due to the emerging LDF which will make the previous policies it represents redundant, and would result in significantly less favourable outcomes for heritage interests.

5.41 Core Policy 39 – Housing density

Efficient use of land and housing densities

5.41.1 This core policy seeks to ensure the efficient use of land and high quality building design, layout and construction, in order to achieve high standards of sustainability in new development, including appropriate densities.

5.41.2 In terms of national planning policy, PPS1 promotes the more efficient use of land through higher density, mixed use development. It also seeks to ensure that outputs are maximised whilst resources used are minimised (for example, by building housing at higher densities). PPS3 requires LPAs to develop housing density policies that set out a range of densities across the plan area, based on the following criteria:

i. The spatial vision and strategy. How much land is available?
ii. The current and future capacity of infrastructure? Can it handle the increase in housing?
iii. The desirability in using land efficiently and reducing the impact of climate change.
iv. Accessibility.
v. The characteristics of an area.
vi. The desirability of achieving high quality design.

What options have been considered?

5.41.3 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential development should be an indicative minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare. Only exceptionally, in locations where there is a strongly defined low density character, will development densities below 30 dwellings per hectare be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As option 1 but with no indicative minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In the following locations the density of development should fall within the ranges specified below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.41.4 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++/?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.41.5 The assessment considers it likely that only Option 2 is likely to lead to significant adverse effects, although a number of other adverse effects have been documented.

5.41.6 **Option 2** sets no indicative minimum and therefore a significant loss of greenfield land could reasonably be expected over the plan period as there is no requirement for building at specific densities. This could significantly affect regeneration in towns such as Trowbridge and Melksham where an urgent need to regenerate the town centre has been established. This could have long-term impacts on the health of the local economy, job growth and retention with continued high levels of out-commuting and retail/leisure related journeys to places such as Bath, Bristol and Swindon.

5.41.7 **Option 2**, being flexible and non-restrictive, could lead to significant wide-ranging housing provision that caters for all sectors of the community. There is some demand for large, executive housing in Wiltshire and this is unlikely to be met through higher density requirements. This option will also allow for higher density and affordable housing, if required.

5.41.8 **Option 3** is likely to give the largest number of significant benefits across all sustainability objectives; it promotes significantly higher density in and around town centres which will aid regeneration in towns that need it, whilst reducing pressures to build on greenfield land on the edge of towns. The lower density requirements for rural areas (20-40dph) will not be significant because rural areas will receive significantly less new homes anyway.
5.41.9 The delivery of higher density housing in town centres can reasonably be expected to benefit local economies, increasing footfall, increasing vitality and viability of existing businesses and other services and facilities.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.41.10 The range of density targets eventually adopted will influence the significance of any effects and the type of effects that occur. Generally, setting targets that promote higher density development will reduce pressure to develop greenfield land and be more likely to achieve remediation of previously developed sites which in Wiltshire are often (but not exclusively) in town centres. This will then aid regeneration attempts with particular social and economic effects.

5.41.11 Some sites and areas require considerable remediation before development can occur; this issue should be addressed in policy or supporting text. Where significant remediation is required, this can affect the viability of a development and the extent of developer contributions that result.

5.41.12 It is unclear how the requirement for town centres in Option 3 has been decided. Between 2001-2010 87dph was achieved in Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury town centres and further consideration could be given to setting higher targets for these towns, if not in other smaller market towns. Option 3 may achieve greater benefits if higher targets were developed for these 3 locations.

5.41.13 Higher densities than the ones proposed would reduce pressure to develop greenfield land further. This would have a range of mainly environmental benefits, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, reduced flood risk and protection of habitats and protected species. However, it is acknowledged that lowering densities can also lead to benefits, specifically in terms of providing a wider range of housing options and creating places that incorporate more open space. It could therefore be argued that Option 3 could allow reduced densities in certain circumstances, as is the case with Option 1.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.41.14 Option 3 is considered to be the most sustainable option because there is likely to be a greater number of significant benefits and no significant adverse effects. There are some concerns that it is rather too rigid in that it does not allow for any exceptional circumstances, as Option 1 does. Sustainability benefits would be enhanced if it recognises that there are circumstances where much lower density developments are needed; these can be located in both urban and rural areas and have a range of social, economic and environmental benefits.
5.42 Core Policy 40 – The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting

What options have been considered?

5.42.1 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain the current policies saved within the extant local plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply a consistent policy approach across the designated site, which draws upon existing best practice, and references statements of outstanding universal value for the combined site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.42.2 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.42.3 No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options; however option 2 is felt to have a greater positive effect than option 1. The existing policies although satisfactory are not necessarily up to date and do not reflect the latest management plan for the Stonehenge World Heritage Sites and do not reflect the sites outstanding universal value, which option 2 achieves.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.42.4 No significant adverse effects are identified. However any policy needs to ensure protection of the World Heritage sites is provided in line with the latest management plan.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?
5.42.5 Option 2 is felt to be most favourable as this ensures the World Heritage Site’s outstanding universal value is preserved.

5.43 **Core Policy 41 - Retail and leisure**

**What options have been considered?**

5.43.1 There are a large number of possible policy options with respect to retail, given the number of towns and villages across Wiltshire that need protection or enhancement in order to ensure their continued vitality and viability. However, many of the individual options for each town are similar in their outcome, namely should retail development be delivered in-town or out-of town?

5.43.2 In Appendix F, similar options have been grouped together for assessment purposes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment matrix A</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td>Any retail / leisure application outside of a Primary or Secondary Area or outside of a village centre should be accompanied by an impact assessment and any proposal involving the creation of more than 200 sq m gross additional retail or leisure floorspace should comply with the sequential approach (the sequential approach should be undertaken in accordance with guidance within PPS4 and / or its supporting document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td>Do not require an impact assessment or sequential test below the 2,500 sq m level proposed within PPS4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment matrix B</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td>Retain current primary and secondary frontages in order to protect and enhance town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
<td>Assess / amend existing primary / secondary frontages either through the Core Strategy or provide hook for Neighbourhood plans / communities to undertake this process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 5</strong></td>
<td>Delete all frontages and corresponding policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 6</strong></td>
<td>Introduce primary / secondary frontages to those towns / villages where these currently do not exist through neighbourhood plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Matrix C</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 7</strong></td>
<td>Provide retail / leisure development, or continue to support existing proposals in the town centres in line with details within community area sections and briefly described here, in the following settlements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Chippenham** – provide good quality cafes and restaurants together with increased retail offer, including a supermarket on the brownfield sites within the town centre.

- **Trowbridge** – provide the comparison goods offer needed and leisure sues identified (cinema, bowling etc) in Trowbridge on town centre Brownfield sites that connect well with the town centre.

- **Bradford-on-Avon** – continue to support the proposed Kingston Mills mixed use development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calne</td>
<td>provide the small scale convenience needed in Calne town centre either through extension to existing or an additional smaller supermarket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>explore town centre sites to accommodate further comparison retail floorspace including the West Central Car Park and the Central Car Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>should Malmesbury plan to clawback convenience trade and look for additional convenience floorspace if a site can be found in the town centre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>should Marlborough look to delivery additional comparison floorspace in the town centre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melksham</td>
<td>additional comparison floorspace identified should be provided in the town centre. A site behind the Avon Place shopping parade should be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>additional comparison floorspace should be delivered by rationalising the central car park area and / or updating the Three Horseshoes Mall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>provide additional comparison floorspace in Westbury in the town centre by removing the existing precinct and combining this with the adjacent BT telephone exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wootton Bassett</td>
<td>clawback convenience trade from Calne by providing additional convenience retail floorspace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 8**

Provide retail / leisure development identified as needed in an out-of-town location, possibly Greenfield sites, at the following settlements:

- **Chippenham** (Greenfield)
- **Trowbridge** (potentially Greenfield)
- **Bradford-on-Avon** (find another site likely to be in a Greenfield / out of town location)
- **Calne** (out-of centre / possibly Greenfield)
- **Devizes** (out-of-centre / possibly Greenfield)
- **Malmesbury** (should Malmesbury clawback convenience trade if site is in an out-of-town / Greenfield location)
- **Marlborough** (provide comparison floorspace in an out of town / greenfield location)
- **Melksham** (provide comparison floorspace in an out of town / greenfield location)
- **Westbury** (provide comparison floorspace in an out of town / greenfield location)
- **Wootton Bassett** (continue to allow convenience trade to leak to Calne)

5.43.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
What significant effects are envisaged?

**Option 1**

5.43.4 No significant adverse effects envisaged. The option aims to try and protect village and town centres through requiring impact assessment / sequential tests at a lower threshold than that required by national policy. Significant positive effects envisaged in terms of town centre regeneration and maintaining vitality and viability.

**Option 2**

5.43.5 Possible significant adverse effect on town / village centres identified in the ‘do nothing’ scenario as there could be a series of retail and leisure developments of just under 2,500 sq m which cumulatively could impact greatly on our town and village centres.

**Options 3, 4 and 6**

5.43.6 The options aim to protect and enhance our village and towns centres by ensuring existing primary and secondary retail frontages are maintained, that new frontages can be introduced in settlements where they do not currently exist and to enable neighbourhoods to amend / introduce frontages and corresponding policy through their neighbourhood plans. The option could have a positive effect with respect to health, inclusion, community, transport and a significant positive effect with respect to the economy.
Option 5

5.43.7 Option 5 is unlikely to achieve any of the positives identified through options 3, 4 and 6 and is likely to have a significant adverse affect on town centres as removing frontage policies could result in the erosion of town centres away from main town centre uses to other uses such as residential at the ground floor level.

Option 7

5.43.8 Where evidence identifies that new retail and / or leisure floorspace is needed, this policy directs such floorspace towards town centres and would result in a significant positive effect on land and soil and the economy, whilst having a positive effect on air quality, transport, community facilities and social inclusion.

Option 8

5.43.9 Directs retail and / or leisure floorspace need to more out of town locations, possibly Greenfield sites. There is potential to have an adverse effect with respect to land and soil, landscape and economy, with unknown or neutral effects with respect to the other sustainability appraisal objectives.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.43.10 Mitigation measures could be introduced, especially to site allocation policies, to ensure areas such as flood mitigation, waste, water resources, air quality, transport, protection of the historic environment and good design are incorporated within policy to ensure the most sustainable development possible is achieved.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.43.11 Option 1, a combination of 3, 4 and 6 and option 7 are considered to be the most sustainable options to take forward. With respect to options 3, 4 and 6, this does not need to be within policy itself, but provision needs to be made for lower level plans or neighbourhood plans to deliver new or amended primary / secondary frontages.

5.43.12 At this stage of drafting policy as such may not be provided for option 7 outside of Trowbridge / Chippenham, but the option should be published to commence discussion with communities in order to assess inclusion within a later version of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

5.44 Core Policy 42 – Sustainable transport

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.44.1 To use the planning and transport powers to reduce the reliance on the car and support the sustainable movement of people and goods.
What options have been considered?

5.44.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader - Use the planning and transport powers to reduce the reliance on the car and support the sustainable movement of people and goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo - Transport plans should be developed for all areas with a view to improving existing transport infrastructure and reducing the need to travel by car.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.44.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.44.4 Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality, reduction in CO₂ emissions, benefits to the historic environment and landscapes because of reductions in car travel and more appropriate routing of freight. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility to key services and goods.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.44.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.44.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.
5.44.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.44.8 Option 1 is considered the most favourable. It offers greater potential to meet the sustainability objectives, in particular there is significant potential to improve the overall quality of people’s lives by improving both the natural and built environment. There should be significant benefits to wildlife through reductions in emissions and improvements to air quality as well the historic, urban and rural environments because of overall reductions in car use which can be visually intrusive create unwanted noise pollution and can cause significant community severance.

5.44.9 The policy should help to reduce social exclusion and create societies that are more inclusive by offering greater sustainable access to key services, facilities, and infrastructure.

5.45 Core Policy 43 - Transport and development

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.45.1 Ensuring that new development is located and designed to reduce the need to travel and to encourage the use of sustainable transport.

What options have been considered?

5.45.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Ensuring that new development is located and designed to reduce the need to travel and to encourage the use of sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Ensuring that accessible, safe and efficient public transport services are available and that measures are provided to encourage walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.45.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.45.4 Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality and reduction in CO2 emissions. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility for all transport users in new developments.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.45.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.45.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.45.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.45.8 Option 1 is considered the most favourable. It offers greater potential to meet the sustainability objectives in new developments, by ensuring that location and design are strongly considered during the initial assessment stages. In particular, there is significant potential to improve the overall quality of people’s lives by improving both the natural and built environment. There should be significant benefits to wildlife through reductions in emissions and improvements to air quality.
5.45.9 The policy should help to reduce social exclusion and create societies that are more inclusive by offering greater sustainable access to all transport users to key services, facilities, and infrastructure.

5.46 **Core Policy 44 - Development impacts on the transport network**

**What is the purpose of this policy?**

5.46.1 To ensure developments provide appropriate mitigating measures to offset adverse transport impacts, including developer contribution towards sustainable transport improvements and the submission of a travel plan.

**What options have been considered?**

5.46.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Developments should provide appropriate mitigating measures to offset adverse transport impacts, including developer contribution towards sustainable transport improvements and the submission of a travel plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Developments should provide appropriate mitigating measures to offset adverse transport impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.46.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.46.4 No significant effects envisaged from either option.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**
5.46.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.46.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.46.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.46.8 Options 1 and 2 are quite similar and therefore it is difficult to choose a preferred option. However, Option 1 is more favourable because it puts a lot of emphasis on developers contributing towards sustainable transport improvements and travel plans. These measures can help to reduce reliance on the car and encourage travel by sustainable transport alternatives, which can provide environmental benefits.

5.47 Core Policy 45 - Transport strategies

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.47.1 Developing transport packages in Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge to achieve a major shift to sustainable transport.

What options have been considered?

5.47.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Developing transport packages in Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge to achieve a major shift to sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Transport plans should be developed for all areas with a view to improving existing transport infrastructure and reducing the need to travel by car. Provision for new or improved interchange facilities between all modes of transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.47.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What significant effects are envisaged?**

5.47.4 Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality and reduction in CO₂ emissions, as well as benefits to the historic environment, and urban landscapes. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility in the identified towns, of Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge.

**What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?**

5.47.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.47.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.47.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

**What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?**

5.47.8 Option 1 is considered the most favourable. It offers greater potential to meet the sustainability objectives in Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge, by considering
a range of relevant measures and improvements. In particular, there is significant potential to improve the overall quality of people’s lives by improving both the natural and built environment. There should be significant benefits to wildlife through reductions in emissions and improvements to air quality. The policy should help to reduce social exclusion and create societies that are more inclusive by offering greater sustainable access to all transport users to key services, facilities, and infrastructure.

5.48 Core Policy 46 - Demand management

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.48.1 Promoting appropriate demand and traffic management measures (e.g. car parking and bus priority measures).

What options have been considered?

5.48.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Promoting appropriate demand and traffic management measures (e.g. car parking and bus priority measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Promoting demand management measures to reduce reliance on the car and encourage the use of sustainable transport measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.48.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-/0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
<td>+/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.48.4 No significant effects envisaged from either option.
What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.48.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.48.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.48.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.48.8 It is very difficult to choose a more favourable option. Both have extremely similar aims and objectives. Option 1 is slightly more favourable because it formally standardises parking charges across the county which should lead to a greater reduction in car use overall and encourages travel by more sustainable alternatives, which should lead to a number of environmental benefits. However, because of the introduction of minimum parking standards for residential development with this option there may be an increase in land take that can have an adverse impact on biodiversity and land and soil resources. In mitigation reduced residential parking requirements will be considered where there is significant urban design or heritage issues, where parking demand is likely to be low or where any parking overspill can be controlled.

5.49 Core Policy 47 - Movement of goods

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.49.1 Achieving a sustainable freight distribution system in terms of routing and HGV parking.

What options have been considered?

5.49.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Achieving a sustainable freight distribution system in terms of routing and HGV parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Encouragement for HGVs to use the roads and parking which have the minimum environmental impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.49.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant effects are envisaged?

5.49.4 No significant effects envisaged from either option.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.49.5 There are no significant adverse effects.

5.49.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.49.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.
What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.49.8 It is difficult to choose a more favourable option. Both have extremely similar aims and objectives. Due to the nature of freight routing there will always be some areas/communities/individuals/businesses that benefit from HGVs using the advisory network, where others will suffer to some degree from the adverse impact. However, Option 1 is probably slightly more favourable because it advocates the use of both rail and water to transport freight wherever possible thus reducing the adverse affects of freight overall.

5.50 Core Policy 48 - Strategic transport network

What is the purpose of this policy?

5.50.1 Improving the strategic transport network (Primary Route Network, freight, key bus and rail networks) including the A350.

What options have been considered?

5.50.2 The following policy options have been developed (further information regarding this policy is contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and accompanying topic papers/background papers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broader – Improving the strategic transport network (PRN, freight, key bus and rail networks) including the A350.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status quo – Improving the strategic transport network (PRN, freight, key bus and rail networks).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.50.3 These options have been appraised for their likely significant effects against the 17 sustainability objectives. The full assessment is presented in Appendix F. A summary of results is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+/?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What significant effects are envisaged?

5.50.4 Option 2 suggests that significant adverse affects will be envisaged for biodiversity, land and soil and flood risk. This is caused primarily because it has many more proposed new road schemes. Most likely impacts will be habitat fragmentation, loss of species and habitat, loss of quality agricultural land and greenfield sites and loss of floodplain.

What mitigation measures would prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant adverse effects of these policy options?

5.50.5 Prior to any new road schemes/improvements being carried out, each new proposal will be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment which will determine the full adverse impacts of such schemes. This will include seeking advice from Natural England, the Environment Agency and other advisory bodies.

5.50.6 The HRA Report recommends that the traffic modelling, undertaken as part of the Core Strategy process to inform infrastructure requirements, should also model emissions to air. This will help provide an evidence base for the HRA and Core Strategy. It also recommends that the Core Strategy includes a specific policy requiring major developments to specifically consider the potential for effects on European sites associated with transport related emissions to air and point source pollution from relevant processes.

5.50.7 As things stand it is considered premature to screen out air quality as an issue in the HRA. It would also be premature to identify specific settlements as being problematic because in the context of European sites it is the road corridors that are potentially problematic. More detailed modelling work is needed to help determine whether or not development associated with a particular settlement will exacerbate the existing situation.

What is considered the most favourable option in sustainability terms and why?

5.50.8 Both of the options are quite similar in their aims and objectives; however, Option 2 clearly proposes many more new road schemes. These schemes are likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts on, such as loss of species and habitat, some of which will be irreversible. Option 1 is therefore considered the more favourable because it is least damaging to the environment.

5.51 Core Policy 49 - Flood risk

5.51.1 This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. However, some significant amendments have been made to the policy and the original South Wilts sustainability appraisal has been revisited. The policy now reads:
“The SHLAA and SFRA currently demonstrate there is a readily available and deliverable 5 year supply of housing land in Flood Zone 1. Development proposed in Flood Zones 2 and 3 as identified within the SFRA will need to refer to this information when providing evidence to the local planning authority in order to apply the Sequential Test in line with the requirements of PPS25.

All new development will include measures to reduce the rate of rainwater run-off and improve rainwater infiltration to soil and ground (sustainable drainage) unless site or environmental conditions make these measures unsuitable”.

5.51.2 In the original assessment, a significant positive effect has already been attributed to the sustainability objective relating to flooding and water efficiency and it is not considered necessary to amend any other assessment scores.

5.51.3 The previous sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix F and a summary of the main findings is given below.

**South Wilts sustainability appraisal summary**

5.51.4 This very specific policy deals with flood risk comprehensively and performs well against not only the flood risk objective but through the indirect implications for health, safety and the economy. No adverse impacts have been identified.

**Mitigation/enhancement recommendations**

5.51.5 None.

5.52 **Core Policy 50 - Water efficiency and the River Avon Special Area of Conservation**

5.52.1 This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. No significant amendments have been made to this policy in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and therefore it is not considered necessary to carry out any further appraisal work.

5.52.2 The previous sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix F and a summary of the main findings is given below.

**South Wilts sustainability appraisal summary**

5.52.3 No adverse effects envisaged. Significant positive effects recorded for sustainability objectives 12 and 15. This policy directly requires new residential development to achieve higher water efficiency standards to overcome potential effects of water use on the River Avon SAC. It also directly addresses potential effects of increased water use from new development on the River Avon SAC, particularly regarding biodiversity.
5.52.4 One area of uncertainty relates to economic growth. There will be additional costs to developers and (perhaps all/partly passed on to) new residents arising from more costly fittings and installations required to achieve higher water efficiency standards. A study by the Environment Agency (Assessing the cost of compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes, 2007) finds the likely cost of CSH level 3 standards just under £300 more per dwelling, which is considered unlikely to be significant to house builders. Reductions in water usage are also understood to be likely to reduce running costs to water companies and water customers/residents.

5.52.5 This policy performs well against environmental sustainability criteria, addressing a specific issue identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. There will be additional costs to business (including house builders) in meeting this policy, but the costs of doing so are uncertain. Additional costs to house builders and residents of installations and fittings are not likely to be significant and would be likely to be offset by savings in running costs for new homes.

Mitigation/enhancement recommendations

5.52.6 None.

5.52.7 In relation to nutrient pollution of the River Avon SAC, the HRA Report also concludes that ‘in relation to potential impacts on the River Avon SAC it can be concluded that, provided development can be accommodated within the existing headroom of the Sewage Treatment Works and the Nutrient Management Plan is implemented, there should be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Avon SAC arising from the Core Strategy’.

5.53 Core Policy 51 - Pollution and phosphate Levels in the water environment

5.53.1 This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. However, some significant amendments have been made to the policy and the original South Wilts sustainability appraisal has been revisited. The amended policy text adds:

“In order to avoid and reduce the potential environmental effects on water quality in the River Avon Special Area of Conservation, appropriate schemes of mitigation, including consideration of suitable buffer zones along watercourses, habitat enhancements and river access management measures, will be required to mitigate potential disturbance effects.’ A Construction Management Plan should also be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to ensure measures proposed during construction are satisfactory”.

5.53.2 In the original assessment, significant positive effects have already been attributed to sustainability objectives relating to improving river quality and biodiversity/geodiversity and it is not considered necessary to amend any other assessment
scores. The policy directly responds to the need to overcome potential water quality effects from new development on the River Avon SAC, arising from the HRA.

5.53.3 The previous sustainability appraisal assessment is presented in Appendix F and a summary of the main findings is given below.

**South Wilts sustainability appraisal summary**

5.53.4 In terms of facilitating economic growth, one area of uncertainty relates to additional costs of implementing this policy. There will be additional costs to developers and (perhaps all/partly passed on to) new residents arising from the need to contribute to a Phosphate Management Plan, with financial costs uncertain at this stage. The policy does not currently allow for alternative means of avoiding impact on the River Avon from wastewater discharges via sewage treatment works, and the need to allow alternative approaches should be considered.

5.53.5 This policy performs well against environmental sustainability criteria, addressing a specific issue identified in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. There will be additional uncertain costs to house builders in meeting this policy.

**Mitigation/enhancement recommendations**

5.53.6 The policy does not currently allow for alternative means of avoiding impact on the River Avon from wastewater discharges, and the need to allow alternative approaches in a revised policy wording should be considered.

5.53.7 In relation to nutrient pollution of the River Avon SAC, the HRA Report accompanying the June 2011 Wiltshire Core Strategy concludes that *in relation to potential impacts on the River Avon SAC it can be concluded that, provided development can be accommodated within the existing headroom of the Sewage Treatment Works and the Nutrient Management Plan is implemented, there should be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Avon SAC arising from the Core Strategy*. 
6 Significant effects and overall sustainability of the Core Strategy

6.1 Introduction

The SEA Directive requires an environmental report to include...

“**The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage) and landscape (and the inter-relationship between the issues above)”**

6.1.1 In the previous section, the **significant** effects of all Core Strategy policy options have been identified, described and evaluated. This has included a discussion of potential mitigation measures for adverse effects, ways of enhancing benefits and a clear recommendation of the favourable option(s) coming out of the sustainability appraisal findings.

6.1.2 It is important that the Sustainability Appraisal Report indicates the more favourable appraisals in support of the options that are recommended to be taken forward and that it highlights which options were not taken forward. At this stage of the Core Strategy, the findings of the sustainability appraisal and forthcoming public consultation will help inform decisions about which are the most preferable options to take forward to the Core Strategy submission stage.

6.2 How has the sustainability appraisal influenced the Core Strategy process so far?

6.2.1 The sustainability appraisal process has been, and will continue to be, undertaken in conjunction with the Core Strategy during the various stages of development, with the sustainability appraisal team and spatial planning team working together on policy development and appraisal of options. The sustainability appraisal team continues to be involved with a number of topic groups to progress policy in different areas.

6.2.2 This report has summarised the findings of the sustainability appraisal that accompanied the ‘Wiltshire 2026’ document in October 2009. At that time, strategic policies were not being considered but the sustainability appraisal helped in the decision-making process to select strategic housing sites in Wiltshire. An example of this is the ongoing sustainability appraisal work regarding sites in Chippenham. Further sustainability appraisal work was undertaken earlier this year on eight locations on the edge of the town and in the town centre and this has helped reduce the number of options now being considered to two. This report has recommended strong protection and enhancement measures for certain sensitive areas in Chippenham and this is reflected in proposed policy.
6.2.3 This report has highlighted various likely significant effects of policies, suggested mitigation measures to reduce adverse effects and made recommendations on policy amendments and preferred options. It is hoped that the Core Strategy takes account of these recommendations and further information will be given in the next stage of the sustainability appraisal for the Core Strategy of any amendments made.

6.3 Significant effects of the Core Strategy and recommended policy options

6.3.1 The following table gives a brief summary of the likely significant effects of the options for each proposed Core Strategy policy and which options are recommended be taken forward in the next stage of the Core Strategy. The more detailed assessment of each policy is presented in Appendix F and summarised in Section 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The settlement hierarchy (part 1) - settlement strategy</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects have been predicted with the three policy options. Significant benefits are envisaged in terms of housing provision through Options 1 and 3.</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delivery strategy</td>
<td>Significant adverse effects are considered likely through Option 3. The removal of settlement boundaries could lead to a significant amount of inappropriate development as decisions on applications are made on a case by case basis. This may then lead to inappropriate urban sprawl/ribbon development or a series of smaller developments that together have a significant cumulative impact in settlements that do not have the infrastructure to cope with such development. Through Option 3, a significant loss of Greenfield land and high value agricultural land may occur and significant landscape impacts. The extent of any impacts would depend on location, type and size of development.</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Infrastructure requirements</td>
<td>No significant effects, either positive or negative, are envisaged through Options 1 and 2. Option 3 will provide a number of significant benefits because it would cover site-specific infrastructure as well as infrastructure covering a much wider area – these benefits include addressing biodiversity protection and enhancement, water resources, landscape issues, flooding, air quality and social</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 – Summary of likely significant effects of Core Strategy policy options and recommended policy options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusion and cohesion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4                       | Chippenham Central Area of Opportunity          | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Biodiversity, landscapes, housing, health, community facilities, transport, economy, employment  
<pre><code>                       | Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None                                                                     | Option 1                    |
</code></pre>
<p>|                         |                                                 | Likely significant positive effects Option 2: Housing                                                                  |                             |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Option 2: None                                                                    |                             |
| 5                       | Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area     | Likely significant positive effects Options 1 and 2: Housing, economy and employment                                 | Option 1                    |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Options 1 and 2: Biodiversity, land and soil, climate, transport                    |                             |
| 6                       | Trowbridge Vision Areas of Opportunity          | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Land and soil, social inclusion, community facilities, economy and employment | Option 1                    |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None                                                                    |                             |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None                                                                    |                             |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Option 2: None                                                                    |                             |
| 7                       | Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area     | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Flood risk, Housing, Transport, economy and employment                 | Option 1                    |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Option 1: Land and soil                                                          |                             |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None                                                                    |                             |
|                         |                                                 | Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Economy and employment                                                |                             |
| 8                       | Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network | No significant effects envisaged. This is a very locally specific policy and no significant effects are considered likely. There may be some very localised and limited impacts on groundwater and surface water, including the River Biss, and potential for some development in areas of flood risk. These effects cannot be determined now; it will depend on the type, size and location of any development which is not currently known. | Options 1 and 2 equally    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area</td>
<td>Both options likely to lead to significant adverse effects relating to biodiversity and significant positive effects relating to housing provision.</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10                      | Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Housing and economy  
Likely significant negative effects Option 1: Land and soil and transport  
Likely significant positive effects Option 2: Housing and economy  
Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Land and soil, landscapes and transport | Option 1 |
| 11                      | Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Housing and economy  
Likely significant negative effects Option 1: Biodiversity  
Likely significant positive effects Option 2: Housing and economy  
Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Biodiversity | Option 1 |
<p>| 12                      | Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area | Significant adverse effects are likely through implementation of all three options in the areas of land and soil, climatic factors and landscape impacts. All options provide for a significant amount of new housing; much is likely to be located on Greenfield sites. Option 3, by restricting development in the town centre may intensify pressure on rural landscapes and soils. Proposals for 2150 new homes in the CA will significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and transport and growth on scale proposed could significantly impact on the AONB through all options. Issues with development at land between A361 and Horton Rd affecting the AONB have been highlighted in the SA/SEA through analysis of the strategic site. Options 1 and 2 will both significantly affect air quality in Devizes. The Core Strategy has highlighted that traffic congestion has led to several Air Quality Management Areas being declared in Devizes. Measures to improve air quality in Devizes need to be considered and could be seen as a constraint to further growth in the short term. Options 1 and 2 will also significantly increase traffic volumes through Devizes. | Option 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Options 1 and 2 will have significant benefits in terms of housing provision and economic/employment opportunities. Option 3 is more restrictive and would be unlikely to provide the same level of benefits for the community area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area</td>
<td>Likely significant positive effects Option 1: None  Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None  Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None  Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Landscapes</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area</td>
<td>Both options will have likely significant benefits for housing, economy and employment. Both options will have likely significant adverse effects relating to land and soil and transport.</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Tidworth and Ludgershall Community Area</td>
<td>Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Landscapes, housing, transport, economy and employment  Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None  Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None  Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Landscapes, transport, economy and employment</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area</td>
<td>Likely significant positive effects Option 1: housing, economy and employment  Likely significant negative effects Option 1: Land and soil  Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None  Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Water resources, economy and employment</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy policy No.</td>
<td>Core Strategy policy name</td>
<td>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</td>
<td>Recommended policy option(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19                       | Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Housing, economy and employment  
Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None  
Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None  
Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Economy and employment | Option 1 |
| 20                       | Spatial Strategy: Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area | Likely significant positive effects Option 1: Landscapes, housing, transport, economy and employment  
Likely significant negative effects Option 1: None  
Likely significant positive effects Option 2: None  
Likely significant negative effects Option 2: Landscapes, transport, economy and employment | Option 1 |
| 21                       | Additional employment land part 1 - New employment land (scale) | Option 1 – no likely significant effects.  
Options 2 and 3 are both likely to provide significant amounts of additional land for employment. Option 2 is considered likely to have significant adverse effects against the sustainability objectives relating to efficient and effective use of land, air quality and environmental pollution and landscapes. | A combination of Options 2 and 3. |
|                          | Additional employment land part 2 - New employment land (scale) | Significant adverse effects are most likely to arise through Option 1. All options offer significant benefits for local economies and employment, although Option 1 would restrict such opportunities to Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham. Option 3 is likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of skills retention, training, apprenticeships etc to allow local businesses to prosper and expand across all communities in Wiltshire. | A combination of Options 2 and 3. |
| 22                       | Existing sites | Significant adverse effects are only considered likely through Option 1. These relate to education and skills, transport, economic growth and employment. Option 3 would protect all employment sites and therefore be most likely out of the three options to give opportunities for developing local skills and allowing local businesses to expand. Options 2 and 3 would both be likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of local economies and | Options 2 and 3 equally. |
Table 8 – Summary of likely significant effects of Core Strategy policy options and recommended policy options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Economic regeneration</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects envisaged from any of the three options. Option 2 is the only option where significant positive effects are likely across all communities. It is likely to lead to regeneration of more brownfield sites in a greater number of locations, so reducing the need for greenfield development. This option also likely to give greater economic and employment benefits as it is less restrictive and does not require sites to be identified in the Core Strategy.</td>
<td>Option 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Re-use of military</td>
<td>Significant effects are considered likely through options 1 and 2. Option 1 is likely to lead to significant benefits in terms of redeveloping sites in locations that are more sustainable and in closer proximity to town centres. Redeveloping sites in appropriate locations will also have significant benefits for Wiltshire’s high value landscapes. Option 2 could have significant adverse effects on biodiversity and rural landscapes but significant benefits in terms of housing provision, employment and local economy.</td>
<td>A combination of Options 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rural diversification and enterprise</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects envisaged with either option. Option 1 does not restrict future employment development just to existing sites and buildings but would allow appropriate new development if well related to a settlement. This is likely to have significant long term benefits for local businesses wishing to expand but not wanting to move away from the area.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sustainable construction and low-carbon energy</td>
<td>Option 1 is proposing the most stringent requirements to mitigate and adapt to climate change and will have significant benefits against sustainability objective 7 as it is the option most likely to result in real reductions of greenhouse gas emissions. Option 3 would fail to address climate change mitigation and adaptation in Core Strategy policy and this would lead to a number of significant adverse effects for biodiversity and flood risk. However, national changes to Building Regulations will still come into force whether or not there is a policy in the Core</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy policy No.</td>
<td>Core Strategy policy name</td>
<td>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</td>
<td>Recommended policy option(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy, therefore impacts may still be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Standalone renewable energy installations</td>
<td>Very few significant effects are considered likely. The only significant adverse effect considered likely relates to Option 1 in terms of landscapes. The provision of a significant number of new standalone renewable energy installations, particularly wind turbines, could cause significant impacts on some of Wiltshire's landscapes.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Providing affordable homes</td>
<td>No significant effects are envisaged through Option 1. Option 2 could have significant adverse impacts on housing provision and human health. Option 3 would be more likely to improve the viability of housing development, meaning that other types of essential social infrastructure could be achieved, thereby increasing the sustainability of communities.</td>
<td>Option 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Meeting housing needs</td>
<td>None of the options are expected to have a significant negative effect. In terms of housing provision, option 3 is felt to have the greatest positive effect as the local evidence should deliver the housing needs required at the local level.</td>
<td>Option 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lifetime Homes standards</td>
<td>No significant effects envisaged. This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. No significant amendments have been made to this policy in the Wiltshire Core Strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects envisaged. Option 3 will lead to significant positive effects with respect to the housing and social inclusion sustainability objectives as this option provides for the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches into the future rather than just to 2011.</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Protection of services and community</td>
<td>No significant effects. This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. However, policy relating to the provision of new community facilities and services (Core Policy 48 of the South Wilts Core Strategy) has not been retained in the Wiltshire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy policy No.</td>
<td>Core Strategy policy name</td>
<td>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</td>
<td>Recommended policy option(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>Core Strategy. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase.</td>
<td>Option 1. and Option 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
<td>Options 3 and 4 will likely lead to significant benefits for biodiversity, water resources, air quality and landscapes. The only option that is considered likely to lead to significant adverse effects is option 4 and that relates to economic growth.</td>
<td>Option 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Options 1 and 2 promote use of a criteria-based approach and offer significantly stronger protection and enhancement of landscape character than Option 3. They are both likely to lead to significant benefits for biodiversity and protection/ enhancement of a range of wildlife habitats. They will also lead to greater protection and enhancement of Wiltshire’s urban and rural landscapes. The only option likely to lead to significant adverse effects is Option 2 - this option is possibly too restrictive and may affect housing and employment provision in main growth areas.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options; however option 1 is felt to have a greater positive effect than option 2. Option 1 will have significant benefits for biodiversity and benefits against many other sustainability objectives compared to Option 2.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure development management policy</td>
<td>Option 1 will have significant benefits for biodiversity. No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ensuring high quality design and place shaping outcomes</td>
<td>No significant effects are envisaged. Option 2 will have a greater range of benefits against the sustainability objectives.</td>
<td>Option 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ensuring protection</td>
<td>Significant benefits can be expected in the areas of rural and urban landscapes and historic environment</td>
<td>Option 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 – Summary of likely significant effects of Core Strategy policy options and recommended policy options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Strategy policy No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Core Strategy policy name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommended policy option(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:-----------------------------</td>
<td>:---------------------------------</td>
<td>:-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>:--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the historic environment</td>
<td>from Option 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39  Housing density</td>
<td>Option 2 sets no indicative minimum and therefore a significant loss of greenfield land could reasonably be expected over the plan period. However, this option being flexible and non-restrictive, could lead to significant wide-ranging housing provision that caters for all sectors of the community. Option 3 is likely to give the largest number of significant benefits across all sustainability objectives; it promotes significantly higher density in and around town centres which will aid regeneration in towns that need it, whilst reducing pressures to build on greenfield land on the edge of towns.</td>
<td>Option 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40  The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting</td>
<td>No significant adverse effects are expected as a result of either of the options. Option 2 will have significant benefits for protection of the historic environment and landscape protection.</td>
<td>Option 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41  Retail and leisure</td>
<td>Eight options were considered for retail and leisure. Of those Options 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 would have significant benefits for local economies – Options 2, 5 and 8 significant adverse effects. Option 7 directs floorspace towards town centres and would also result in a significant positive effect on land and soil resources. Option 8 directs retail and / or leisure floorspace need to more out of town locations, possibly greenfield sites, and there could be significant loss of greenfield land and adverse impacts on landscapes.</td>
<td>Option 1, a combination of 3, 4 and 6 and option 7 are considered to be the most sustainable options to take forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42  Sustainable transport</td>
<td>Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality, reduction in CO$_2$ emissions, benefits to the historic environment and landscapes because of reductions in car travel and more appropriate routing of freight. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility to key services and goods.</td>
<td>Option1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy policy No.</td>
<td>Core Strategy policy name</td>
<td>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</td>
<td>Recommended policy option(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Transport and development</td>
<td>Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality and reduction in CO₂ emissions. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility for all transport users in new developments.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Development impacts on the transport network</td>
<td>No significant effects envisaged from either option.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Transport strategies</td>
<td>Option 1 provides a number of significant positive effects, improvements to air quality and reduction in CO₂ emissions, as well as benefits to the historic environment, and urban landscapes. It also significantly encourages sustainable travel and improves overall accessibility in the identified towns, of Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Demand management</td>
<td>No significant effects envisaged from either option.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Movement of goods</td>
<td>No significant effects envisaged from either option.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Strategic transport network</td>
<td>Option 2 suggests that significant adverse affects will be envisaged for biodiversity, land and soil and flood risk. This is caused primarily because it has many more proposed new road schemes. Most likely impacts will be habitat fragmentation, loss of species and habitat, loss of quality agricultural land and greenfield sites and loss of floodplain.</td>
<td>Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Flood risk</td>
<td>This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. A significant positive effect has been attributed to the sustainability objective relating to flooding and water efficiency. No adverse impacts have been identified.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Water efficiency</td>
<td>This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 – Summary of likely significant effects of Core Strategy policy options and recommended policy options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy policy No.</th>
<th>Core Strategy policy name</th>
<th>Summary of likely significant effects of policy options</th>
<th>Recommended policy option(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pollution and phosphate levels in the water environment</td>
<td>This policy is included in the South Wilts Core Strategy and has already been subject to sustainability appraisal. Significant positive effects have been attributed to sustainability objectives relating to improving river quality and biodiversity/geodiversity. The policy directly responds to the need to overcome potential water quality effects from new development on the River Avon SAC, arising from recommendations in the HRA.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 **Cumulative effects and other effects of the Core Strategy**

6.4.1 The SEA Regulations require consideration of likely significant effects, to include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects. The terms ‘secondary’, ‘cumulative’ and ‘synergistic’ are not mutually exclusive; often the term cumulative effects is taken to include secondary and synergistic effects.

6.4.2 Many sustainability problems result from the accumulation of multiple small and often indirect effects, rather than a few large and obvious ones. Examples include loss of tranquillity and habitat fragmentation caused by a number of different developments, landscape changes and climate change.

6.4.3 There is often some uncertainty in predicting cumulative effects as the cause of some effects can be difficult to identify. This can arise due to variation in natural systems and their interactions or lack of information on cause-effect relationships. With a higher level plan such as the Core Strategy, the level of uncertainty can be greater because scales are broader and issues generally larger.

6.4.4 A wide range of different types of effects of Core Strategy policies, both positive and negative, have been predicted, described and evaluated in section 5 and Appendix F of this report. This has included consideration of cumulative effects where they were thought likely to occur; it is not intended to repeat them all here. However, some of the key cumulative effects of the Core Strategy are likely to be:

6.4.5 **Biodiversity and habitat fragmentation** – the Core Strategy contains strong policies to protect and enhance biodiversity, including wide-ranging Green Infrastructure policies, but the level of housing and employment provision proposed is likely to have some adverse effects on wildlife habitats. Greenfield development is more likely to cause such impacts but development on brownfield sites, especially ones that have been redundant for long periods, may also have impacts. Development may lead to direct loss of some important habitats but effects are more likely from indirect effects such as recreational pressure and air/noise/light pollution.

6.4.6 It is possible that Core Strategy policies promoting countryside access, such as Green Infrastructure policies, may increase pressure on some habitats eg the Cricklade Country Way may increase visitor numbers at North Meadow SAC.

6.4.7 **Landscape and rural character** – changes to rural character and landscapes will result from proposed development in edge-of-town locations. This is most likely from the larger urban extensions proposed in Trowbridge and Salisbury but also likely in other settlements. Impacts may also occur if development takes place at a number of brownfield sites in a particular settlement and careful consideration of final use and design/layout considerations will be required.

6.4.8 **Waste** – development and population increase will have cumulative effects on amounts of waste, despite increases in recycling rates across Wiltshire. New landfill sites may need to be found.
6.4.9 **Transport** – housing and employment growth will increase need to travel and increase traffic volumes. The Core Strategy contains policies promoting sustainable transport but increases in road traffic are likely with the level of growth proposed. Cumulative effects of new housing and employment development in recent years along the A350 corridor, together with that proposed for future years, may mean that dualling of the A350 in certain locations may be needed. There are also cumulative effects of development in settlements such as Devizes as population increase has increased road traffic leading to congestion, particularly at peak times.

6.4.10 **Water resources** – there will be increased pressures on water resources from population growth, in terms of need for water abstraction from watercourses and indirect pollution such as increases in phosphate discharges from sewage treatment works. Likely increased pressures if predicted impacts of climate change result in warmer, drier summers.

6.4.11 **Local economy and employment** – proposed growth levels could significantly benefit the local economy, of Wiltshire in general and of individual settlements. There will be important secondary effects for local businesses from a larger potential market. Housing and employment growth can increase self-containment, reducing out-commuting and significantly improving services such as public transport if critical thresholds reached.

6.4.12 **Flood risk** – much proposed development likely on greenfield land. Although possible for development to avoid areas of flood risk at proposed locations, replacing greenfield land with impermeable surfaces can increase flood risk in that location or elsewhere. As numbers of new developments grow, flood risk increases. Avoidance of areas of flood risk and dealing effectively with surface water, including consideration of sustainable drainage systems will be a requirement for all development proposals.

6.4.13 **Air quality and environmental pollution** – impacts on air quality and increases in noise and light pollution can result from development, as well as loss of tranquillity. Indirect effects of growth include transport related emissions which are the cause of most of the AQMAs in town centre locations in Wiltshire.

6.4.14 **Climatic impacts** – increases in greenhouse gas emissions that are recognised as being one of the causes of climate change - likely to increase from energy use in the home and from industry and rising traffic volumes. Increased development must be accompanied by effective mitigation to reduce energy use overall, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce the need to travel/increase travel choice.

6.4.15 **Heritage assets** – Wiltshire contains many heritage assets and these can be directly affected by development in proximity or indirectly through recreation, increased visitor numbers, noise, light, air pollution, car use.

6.4.16 **Housing** – levels of housing provision proposed will increase the range and choice of modern housing stock, including affordable housing. This can also benefit rural
by giving people the opportunity to live in their own community and increase viability of local businesses such as pubs and shops.

6.4.17 **Community services and facilities** – the cumulative impact of new housing growth can place pressure on existing services and facilities such as healthcare services, community support services and education. However, growth can also help fund new services and facilities or new infrastructure than can greatly improve recreational or sporting opportunities. It is important that growth is supported by appropriate infrastructure provision and levels of funding for community services.

6.4.18 **Renewable energy** – policies relating to renewable energy may result in increased installation of photovoltaic panels, biomass plants, wind turbines etc. There will be landscape and amenity issues with increasing numbers and in some areas their presence may prove controversial.

**Cumulative effects with neighbouring authorities’ plans**

6.4.19 Cumulative effects are also likely to occur in combination with the emerging (or adopted) Core Strategies of neighbouring authorities to Wiltshire. Levels of proposed growth in neighbouring authorities, in general, are less than the levels proposed in the South West RSS but effects are still likely.

6.4.20 Cumulative effects are likely to relate mainly to impacts of transport, with issues of increased traffic volumes on roads such as the A350, A36 and M4 in north and west Wiltshire. These issues will result mainly from in/out-commuting for employment purposes and these impacts are most likely in combination with levels of growth proposed in Bath and North East Somerset and Swindon Borough Council. There are established issues of out-commuting from Wiltshire to Bristol, Bath and Bristol and therefore levels of growth proposed by those authorities will particularly impact on Wiltshire.

**6.5 Potential mitigation measures for likely significant effects**

6.5.1 This report has predicted and described a wide range of significant and minor effects that are likely from implementing Core Strategy policies. The assessment has included consideration of mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects and ways of maximising the positive effects.

6.5.2 Specific mitigation measures are described under each policy heading in section 5 and in Appendix F (Core policies), Appendix G (strategic housing sites) and Appendix H (strategic employment sites); they are many and varied, and it is not possible to list them all in this section. However, mitigation measures to address what are considered to be the key significant adverse effects of the Core Strategy are listed below:

6.5.3 **Biodiversity** – development can potentially lead to direct or indirect loss/damage to biodiversity and wildlife habitats. Consideration should be given to avoiding
development where adverse effects are likely on designated sites, protected and/or notable species and ancient woodland. Development of brownfield sites would often lead to less impacts and this is preferred. Where development of greenfield sites is necessary, mature trees and ecologically important hedgerows should be retained wherever possible, appropriate buffer zones should protect any ecologically important areas and biodiversity should be enhanced overall throughout.

6.5.4 Further information regarding ways of reducing and avoiding adverse effects on European sites is contained within the HRA Report that accompanies the Core Strategy.

6.5.5 Land and soil resources – there is a shortage of previously developed sites in Wiltshire to meet housing and employment needs. However, policy should prioritise development on previously developed sites, wherever possible, that have good access to local facilities, public transport links and key infrastructure. Where this is not possible or appropriate, greenfield sites should be prioritised where development can be located adjacent to an existing urban area to take advantage of existing services and facilities. Housing development should be built at maximum densities to minimise greenfield loss and if possible avoid development of higher quality agricultural land.

6.5.6 Landscapes – many areas of Wiltshire come under a national or local landscape designation such as an AONB or Special Landscape Area (SLA). Many of the proposed strategic development sites do not fall within these areas but because the majority of them are large greenfield sites on the edge of urban areas, there is potential to significantly change the current rural character. Any development should be sensitive to the rural character of these areas with high quality design considerations and appropriate landscaping. Many of these strategic sites are also large enough to incorporate significant areas of Green Infrastructure which could include substantial biodiversity enhancement.

6.5.7 Water resources – growth and population increase will increase demand for water and predicted effects of climate change may add to this. There is a need to reduce the effects of water abstraction on Wiltshire’s rivers and those outside the authority area by incorporating strong measures to increase water efficiency and to reduce water use in the home and in industry. Any further growth would need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within the sewerage network and avoid possible pollution to watercourses.

6.5.8 Climatic factors – all development should meet high levels of energy efficiency and consider meeting the majority, if not all, of the energy and heat demand through renewable or low carbon forms of generation. There is strong potential for mitigation of climate change impacts at many of the proposed strategic sites and potential to provide renewable forms of energy and heat on site, and to link in with adjoining residential/employment areas. Consideration should be given to climate change adaptation through building design and layout and through measures to deal with surface water and flood risk.
6.5.9 **Transport** – levels of growth are likely to significantly increase traffic volumes throughout Wiltshire. Strong promotion of (and investment in) public transport and walking/cycling routes will be necessary at any future location for housing and employment growth with safe and convenient routes linking with town centres. There will be a need for new road infrastructure but this should avoid further congestion in town centres. Future dualling of the A350 may also be required.

6.6 **Overall sustainability of the Core Strategy**

6.6.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has investigated the likely significant effects of implementing the Core Strategy and it has found that significant effects, both positive and negative, are likely in a number of areas. It has been shown, however, that it is possible to reduce or avoid many of the predicted adverse effects of implementation; the Core Strategy contains strong policies in the areas of biodiversity, energy efficiency and renewable energy, historic environment, landscape and infrastructure to enable effective mitigation to be put in place.

6.6.2 Impacts that will be difficult to mitigate fully, resulting from the level of growth proposed and proposed locations for development, and which will require innovative solutions, investment and community involvement, are likely to relate to the following sustainability objectives:

- Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings
- Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner
- Improve air quality throughout Wiltshire and minimise all sources of environmental pollution
- Minimise our impacts on climate change and reduce our vulnerability to future climate change effects
- Protect and enhance the character and quality of Wiltshire’s rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place
- Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices

6.6.3 However, significant benefits can be expected in relation to the following sustainability objectives:

- Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures
- Improve equality of access to, and engagement in local, high-quality community services and facilities
- Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth.
- Ensure adequate provision of high-quality employment land and diverse employment opportunities to meet the needs of local businesses and a changing workforce
These benefits can be considerably enhanced by ensuring that development takes place in consultation with local communities that will be affected the most from new development and ensuring that appropriate infrastructure is in place to meet the needs of local communities.
7 Monitoring of significant effects

The SEA Directive requires that the Environmental Report shall include...

“a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring…” and that...

“Member States shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes in order, inter alia, to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action”

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The SEA Directive requires the significant environmental effects of plans and programmes to be monitored, in order to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to take appropriate action where necessary.

7.1.2 The monitoring undertaken on the Core Strategy will help to:

- monitor the significant effects of the plan
- track whether the plan has had any unforeseen effects
- ensure that action can be taken to reduce / offset the significant effects of the plan
- provide baseline data for future sustainability appraisals and to provide a picture of how the environment / sustainability criteria of the area are evolving.

7.1.3 The requirements of the SEA Directive focus on monitoring the effects of the plan. This equates to both the plan’s significant effects and also unforeseen effects. It may be difficult to implement monitoring mechanisms for unexpected effects, or to attribute such effects to the implementation of the Core Strategy when they occur. However, this provision may be understood as covering effects which differ from those which were predicted, or unforeseen effects which are due to changes of circumstances.

7.1.4 It is good practice that the monitoring of significant sustainability effects should be integrated with other monitoring of Local Development Frameworks. For this reason, Wiltshire Council will report significant sustainability effects in future Annual Monitoring Reports published each December.
7.2 Proposed significant effects monitoring indicators

7.2.1 Proposed significant sustainability effects indicators are presented separately in Appendix I. These have been drawn from the baseline information and key sustainability issues published within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and are identified to monitor potential significant adverse effects highlighted in this report.

7.2.2 These indicators aim to:

- concentrate on the key sustainability issues identified in the appraisal
- provide information to identify when problems, including unexpected ones arise
- contribute to addressing deficiencies in data availability identified in this appraisal.

7.2.3 Monitoring will allow the Council to identify whether the recommended mitigation measures from the sustainability appraisal have been effective and to develop further mitigation proposals that may be required where unforeseen adverse effects are identified. In some cases monitoring may identify the need for a policy to be amended or deleted, which could trigger a review of the Core Strategy, or for further policy guidance to be developed eg in a Supplementary Planning Document.
8 Next steps

8.1 This is an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and the process of assessing Core Strategy policies will continue after the results of this public consultation stage have been taken into account. The results of the public consultation will inform the next iteration of the sustainability appraisal.

8.2 It has been stated in each Community Area section that further appraisal work is needed to assess housing numbers and amounts of employment land in each Community Area, and reasonable alternatives to these figures. These findings will be published in the next stage of the sustainability appraisal that will accompany the Core Strategy Submission document. This will also include any additional appraisal work in relation to any significant amendments that may be made to the Core Strategy.
This document was published by the Spatial Plans team, Wiltshire Council, Economy and Enterprise.

For further information please visit the following website:

http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal