

Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Alternative Development Strategies (Standard Method)

Option CH-A - Rolling forward the core strategy includes employment land at Calne, Corsham and Melksham

Option CH-B - Chippenham expanded community - Melksham and the more constrained settlements of Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury all continue at WCS rates i.e. no change and continuation; and Chippenham receives the balance 8,335 homes). Includes employment at Calne and Chippenham

Option CH-C - Melksham Focus (3,370) - albeit Chippenham still significant (5,915) and higher growth in rest of HMA. Growth is diverted from more constrained places (Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury) and includes employment at Chippenham and Melksham

Proposed distribution of housing requirement – Chippenham HMA						
Settlement	Option CH-A		Option CH-B		Option CH-C	
	Housing	Employment (ha)	Housing	Employment (ha)	Housing	Employment (ha)
Calne	1750	5	1230	2	1375	0
Chippenham	5495	0	8335	7	5915	0
Corsham	1485	2	1040	0	1165	4
Devizes	2450	0	1715	0	1920	0
Malmesbury	1075	0	755	0	845	0
Melksham	2730	2	1910	0	3370	5
Rest of HMA	2425	0	2425	0	2815	0
TOTAL	17410	9	17410	9	17410	9

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 1: Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Avoid potential negative impacts of development on designated wildlife sites, protected species and priority species and habitats (international, national, local) and enhance these where possible?

While **Calne** has no legislative ecological constraints of statutory designations adjacent or nearby, there are a number of non-statutory designations. Furthermore, the settlement is a hotspot for the protected great crested newt, and the woodlands surrounding Bowood may provide an important habitat for Annex II bats. If further assessment confirms this, development should avoid these woodland areas, as well as the restored mineral and waste sites to the east which provide a function for wildlife.

Corsham lies partially within the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC core sustenance area, with Box Mine SSSI a component of this. As well as these statutory designations, there are several CWS designations which provide some ancient woodland habitat for Annex II bat species. The railway line and parkland also provide habitat connectivity for Annex II bat species. Development in the particularly sensitive areas, such as the area to the west of Corsham between Rudloe, are likely to lead to significant pressure on Annex II bat species which would not be possible to mitigate successfully. Furthermore, lighting caused by additional infrastructure in Corsham is likely to lead to adverse effects to Annex II bat species.

Similarly, **Devizes** contains several Annex II bat species hotspots which provide a habitat for bats associated with the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC, as well as commuting and foraging routes. This includes the area around Devizes Castle, the disused railway line, the Kennet and Avon Canal and areas of woodland including the statutory designation of Drew's Pond Wood LNR. Development on or adjacent to these areas reduces the permeability of the landscape for bats and would negatively impact Annex II bat species.

In **Chippenham**, there are several CWS designations adjacent to and within the settlement boundary, as well as the statutory designation of Mortimer's Wood LNR located to the south of Chippenham. As the LNR lies to the east of a site allocated in the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan, care will be needed to ensure that cumulative impacts from potential further development surrounding the LNR do not lead to negative effects.

While there are no legislative ecological constraints of statutory designations adjacent to or nearby **Melksham**, there are several non-statutory ecological designations including the Bristol Avon CWS and Conigre Mead WWT. Furthermore, the settlement contains the habitats of protected species including great crested newts to the south of Bowerhill and east of Melksham, and otters and water voles associated with the watercourses of Bristol Avon, Clackers Brook and Semington Brook. These watercourses also act as key primary connective habitats.

There are several CWS designations in **Malmesbury**, as well as the statutory designation of Conigre Mead LNR to the east of the settlement. The River Avon also acts as a hotspot for the protected species of crayfish, otters and water vole, and acts as the main connective corridor.

Some areas in the **Rest of the HMA** are designated SSSIs, lie within the buffers of SACs, or contain important habitats including ancient woodland.

DAQ 2: Ensure that all new developments protect Local Geological Sites (LGSs) from development?

While there are no settlements in the Chippenham HMA in direct proximity to an LGS (formerly Regional Sites of Geological Importance, or RIG) there is a RIG to the north of Devizes at Oliver's Castle.

DAQ 3: Aid in the delivery of a network of multifunctional Green Infrastructure?

The design of developments may incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity and contribute to networks of multifunctional green space known as green infrastructure. The preparation of a Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy will help to provide a long-term vision and strategic framework to aid the delivery of GI. However, at this stage of the process, it is not possible to comment on the likelihood of GI being adopted as part of development.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
---------------------	------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Calne	There are few ecological constraints at Calne, however there are uncertainties regarding likely effects on biodiversity overall, it is likely that rolling forward the Core Strategy would lead to a minor adverse effect at Calne.	This option proposes a level of growth that is considerably lower than CH-A. Additionally, there are few ecological constraints at Calne. Therefore, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.	This option proposes a level of growth that is considerably lower than CH-A and slightly higher than CH-B. Likely effects will be similar as CH-B. Additionally, there are few ecological constraints at Calne. Therefore, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	Rolling forward the Core Strategy proposes a low level of growth for Chippenham. Due to biodiversity constraints and the need to consider cumulative effects of development on biodiversity designations, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	CH-B proposes a higher level of growth at Chippenham than rolling forward the Core Strategy. On this basis and taking account of constraints, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	CH-C proposes a similar level of growth to the roll forward. Therefore, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect as a result of this strategy at Chippenham.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Corsham	The settlement is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species. Rolling forward the Core Strategy would therefore lead to a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward, but the settlement is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species. This strategy would lead to a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward, but the settlement is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species. Therefore, a moderate adverse effect is likely at Corsham.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Devizes	The Core Strategy Continued proposes a high level of growth for Devizes, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects due to biodiversity constraints identified, including Annex II bat species and their habitats.	As this strategy proposes a lower growth option than the Core Strategy Continued at Devizes, minor adverse effects are anticipated due to biodiversity constraints, including Annex II bat species and their habitats.	Due to levels of growth at Devizes in this strategy being more or less commensurate with Core Strategy Continued, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects due to biodiversity constraints, including Annex II bat species and their habitats.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Core Strategy Continued proposes a moderate level of growth for Malmesbury. As a result, due to potential impacts on Conigre Mead, CWSs and the River Avon, a minor adverse effect is likely.	As CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Malmesbury compared to Core Strategy Continued, and the lowest level of all alternatives, it is anticipated that the proposed growth quantum might be accommodated without negatively impacting these areas of sensitive biodiversity. Overall, a minor adverse effect is deemed likely.	This strategy proposes a level of growth at Malmesbury more or less commensurate with Core Strategy Continued. As a result, due to potential impacts on Conigre Mead, CWSs and the River Avon, a minor adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse

Melksham	While this strategy proposes a moderate level of growth to Melksham, there are no ecological designations adjacent or nearby to the town. Overall, while it is anticipated that development could avoid areas of ecological sensitivity, this option is likely to have a minor adverse effect.	As CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Melksham compared to Core Strategy Continued, it is anticipated that development could avoid areas of ecological sensitivity. Overall, this option is likely to have a minor adverse effect on biodiversity in the Melksham area.	This strategy proposes a higher level of growth at Melksham compared to Core Strategy Continue, however when taking account of the level of growth proposed and the few ecological designations, minor adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.4 CH-A is likely to lead to minor adverse effects due to the potential impact of additional development on Annex II bat species in the settlements of Calne, Corsham and Devizes.	-1.3 CH-B is likely to lead to minor adverse effects due to the potential impact of additional development on Annex II bat species in the settlements of Calne, Corsham and Devizes, as well as the high level of growth proposed in Chippenham.	-1.3 CH-C is likely to lead to minor adverse effects due to the potential impact of additional development on Annex II bat species in the settlements of Calne, Corsham and Devizes, as well as the high level of growth proposed in Melksham.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

When comparing strategies CH-B and CH-C to the roll forward, similar minor effects are anticipated. However, moderate effects are likely at Chippenham and Devizes through CH-B alongside a higher level of growth and at Corsham, Devizes and Melksham through CH-C.

Strategy CH-C is the most sustainable strategy as it is likely to have fewer adverse effects than the other strategies.

Strategies CH-A and CH-B score equally and are the least sustainable strategies as they are likely to have greater adverse effects.

Biodiversity issues in the Chippenham HMA are mainly focussed around protecting Annex II bat species due to the internationally designated Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC/SSSI. There are also a number of local biodiversity designations (LNR/CWS/SSSI) at all of the settlements assessed and in the rest of the HMA area which have the potential to be adversely affected by development.

Where the level of growth proposed in settlements requires the development of additional infrastructure, an early decision on the location of such infrastructure will be needed to avoid fragmenting key connective habitats such as watercourses and woodland.

As Corsham lies within the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC/SSSI, the settlement is considered to be the most at risk of any impacts on biodiversity as any additional growth, without appropriate mitigation, poses a risk to biodiversity. As a result, moderate adverse effects are likely in the settlement across all strategies.

All strategies within this option are considered to have a minor adverse effect on the HMA as a whole. CH-A rolling forward the current strategy is likely to have a more severe effect at Corsham and Devizes than at other settlements in the HMA, although minor adverse effects are likely across the HMA with relation to biodiversity.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2: Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Ensure efficient use of land?

The design of specific developments will involve setting appropriate housing densities for development will be part of the planning process at a later stage. At this stage of the process, it is not possible to comment on the design and density of developments.

DAQ 2: Lead to the reuse of Previously Developed Land where possible/appropriate?

There is a lack of previously developed land (PDL) across the HMA. Therefore, all strategies are likely to result in the loss of greenfield land.

DAQ 3: Encourage remediation of contaminated land? If so, would this lead to issues of viability and deliverability?

Across Wiltshire, some 14000 sites of potential contamination exist as a result of a range of historical land uses; 225 high priority sites have been identified as part of a prioritised approach to inspection.

Currently 4 sites have been determined as contaminated land and remediated. The remediation of contaminated land will be principally addressed through the planning process where former sites change their use.

DAQ 4: Result in the permanent loss of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3a)?

The majority of the agricultural land surrounding **Chippenham** is Grade 3 (good to moderate) with areas of Grade 2 (very good) land in the north east and south, where there are also smaller patches of Grade 1 (excellent).

Malmesbury is surrounded by mainly Grade 3 agricultural land with some patches of Grade 4.

Calne is surrounded almost entirely by Grade 3 agricultural land, with a small area of Grade 4 to the west and some small areas of Grade 2 to the south east and north west.

Corsham is surrounded entirely by Grade 3 agricultural land, with a patch of Grade 2 land to the south.

Devizes is the most constrained settlement in the HMA with regards to the proportion of BMV agricultural land surrounding the urban area. While there are areas of Grade 3 land, there is also an equal proportion of Grade 1 and Grade 2 land.

While **Melksham** has some patches of Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land surrounding the settlement, the majority is Grade 3 with some patches of Grade 4.

While the majority of the **Rest of the HMA** is Grade 3, the south of the HMA contains a large proportion of Grade 1 and 2 land.

DAQ 5: Lead to the sterilisation of viable mineral resources? If so, is there potential to extract the mineral resource as part of the development?

The area to the south and north east of Chippenham is a designated Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA).

The area surrounding **Calne** to the western side and the eastern side is a designated Mineral Resource Block and MSA.

An MSA surrounds **Corsham** apart from the east which also covers some of the built-up area of Corsham.

There is an MSA extending from the north west of **Melksham** to the south west, which includes some of the north west built up area of Melksham.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Calne would lead to the loss of greenfield land. There is BMV land is situated around the settlement and therefore development would need to avoid areas of BMV agricultural land and MSAs. As rolling forward the Core strategy proposes a low level of growth and both BMV agricultural land and MSAs are apparent at Calne, it is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the WCS roll forward. There are more opportunities to direct development away from BMV agricultural land and MSAs as a result. It is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the WCS roll forward. There are more opportunities to direct development away from BMV agricultural land and MSAs as a result. It is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Chippenham would lead to the loss of greenfield land. Rolling forward the Core Strategy would lead to high level of growth at a settlement where BMV agricultural land and MSAs are apparent. As these are not vast, there are opportunities to direct development away from these and a moderate adverse effect on this objective is considered likely.	CH-B proposes a higher level of growth when compared to rolling forward the Core Strategy. Opportunities to direct development away from BMV agricultural land and MSAs will be lessened as a result of this strategy. It is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a similar, but higher level of growth at Chippenham when compared to CH-A. As a result, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely.

	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Corsham would lead to the loss of greenfield land. Corsham is subject to a small amount of BMV agricultural land and a large MSA. As rolling forward the Core Strategy proposes a moderate level of growth, a minor adverse effect is likely.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward of the Core Strategy. There would be more opportunities to direct development away from the BMV agricultural land and MSAs. As BMV agricultural land and MSAs remain apparent, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward of the Core Strategy. There would be more opportunities to direct development away from the BMV agricultural land and MSAs. As BMV agricultural land and MSAs remain apparent, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Devizes	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Devizes would lead to the loss of greenfield land, however Devizes does have some capacity for PDL. This town is the most constrained with relation to BMV agricultural land but is not subject to any MSAs. The roll forward is likely to lead a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth and is more capable of directing development away from BMV agricultural land. As Devizes is subject to vast amount of BMV agricultural land, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a level of growth lower than the Core Strategy roll forward and is more capable of directing development away from BMV agricultural land. As Devizes is subject to vast amount of BMV agricultural land, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Malmesbury would lead to the loss of greenfield land. While Malmesbury is surrounded by Grade 3 agricultural land, it is unclear how much of falls into category 3a. The roll forward proposes a moderate level of growth and despite uncertainties regarding BMV agricultural land, the roll forward of the Core Strategy is likely to lead to a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth. Although uncertainties relating to BMV agricultural land remain, this strategy would be capable of directing development away from BMV agricultural land. It is likely that this strategy would have a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of growth. Although uncertainties relating to BMV agricultural land remain, this strategy would be capable of directing development away from BMV agricultural land. It is likely that this strategy would have a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Melksham	Due to low levels of PDL across the HMA it is likely that growth at Melksham would lead to the loss of greenfield land. Some BMV agricultural land and MSA are situated on the edge of the settlement. Further investigation is required with relation to Grade 3 agricultural land. The roll forward proposes a moderate level of growth for the settlement, which increases upon the quantum allocated by the WCS. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward. This strategy would be more capable of directing growth away from BMV agricultural land and the MSA. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a higher level of growth at Melksham than the other strategy options. This quantum of growth would make it more difficult to direct development away from BMV agricultural land and MSAs. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.

	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV land. However, as the majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield land, minor adverse effects are likely.	Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV land. However, as the majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield land, minor adverse effects are likely. This strategy proposes an equivalent level to rolling forward the current strategy and would therefore a similar effect would be likely.	Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and minerals safeguarded land. However, as the majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. This option proposes a higher level of growth than CH-A and CH-B and as a result, this strategy is likely to have moderate adverse effects.
Overall HMA score	Likely effects: minor adverse -1.3 Due to the levels of growth proposed in Devizes and Melksham which have more BMV land surrounding them, there is a risk of the loss of BMV land. Therefore, this strategy is likely to have a minor adverse impact on SA Objective 2.	Likely effects: minor adverse -1.3 Due to the levels of growth proposed in Chippenham which have BMV land surrounding them, this strategy poses a risk of a large amount of loss of BMV land. Therefore, this strategy is likely to have a minor adverse impact on SA Objective 2.	Likely effects: moderate adverse -1.4 Due to the levels of growth proposed in Devizes and Melksham which have BMV land surrounding them, this strategy poses a risk of a large amount of loss of BMV land. Therefore, this strategy is likely to have a minor adverse impact on SA Objective 2.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

All strategies score very similarly and are likely to have minor adverse effects overall. However, **Strategy CH-B is considered the most sustainable option against this objective** as it will have fewer adverse effects than the other strategies.

Strategy CH-A is considered the least sustainable option against this objective as it will have greater adverse effects than the other strategies. This strategy is more likely to lead to moderate adverse effects across the HMA. Additionally, CH-A proposes the highest level of growth across the smaller settlements of Corsham, Calne and Melksham.

Moderate adverse effects are considered likely at Chippenham and Melksham, respectively and through these options as mitigation is more problematic due to the high level of housing proposed at the two settlements. However, effects can be avoided by directing growth away from BMV agricultural land and MSAs where possible, additionally mitigation opportunities may emerge as more detail assessment is carried out.

There is a lack of previously developed land (PDL) across the whole HMA. Therefore, all strategies are likely to result in the loss of greenfield land and will potentially lead to the loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a). However, without knowing the exact location of growth and the extent of what BMV land is required, it is anticipated that at least minor adverse impacts will occur in all strategies. Further assessment is likely to be needed to distinguish between Grade 3a land and Grade 3b land.

Uncertainties also exist regarding the potential for mineral resources to be lost and the potential for remediation of contaminated land.

To reduce adverse effects against this objective, development should avoid BMV and minerals safeguarding land, where possible, brownfield land should be prioritised and higher density levels should be considered, where appropriate.

Devizes is considered the most constrained settlement in the Chippenham HMA with regards to this objective due to the high proportion of BMV land surrounding the town. Similarly, Melksham and Chippenham both have areas of BMV land surrounding them, however, these are smaller areas compared to Devizes. Chippenham is likely to have moderate adverse effects across all strategies due to the significant amount of growth proposed in all strategies.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3: Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Protect surface, ground and drinking water quality?

Malmesbury and surrounds are subject to Source Protection Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 1c (Subsurface Activity), 2 (Outer Protection Zone), 2c (Subsurface Activity) and 3 (Total Catchment).

Devizes is not affected by any water resource protection area, but Source Protection Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 (Total Catchment) are positioned to the north east of the settlement boundary.

Melksham and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection areas. Protection is given to water resources to the south west of the settlement boundary, however. These are Source Protection Zones 2c (Subsurface Activity) and 3c (Subsurface Activity) and a Drinking Water Protection Area.

Corsham is encompassed by Source Protection Zones 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 (Total Catchment). Some areas of Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone) are apparent to the east and south east of the settlement. A Drinking Water Protection Area (Groundwater) is positioned to the south of the settlement boundary, beyond Neston.

Chippenham is the largest settlement within this HMA and it is covered in its entirety by Source Protection Zones 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 2c (Subsurface Activity). These extend beyond the settlement to the west, north and east.

Calne and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection zones. Source Protection Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 2 (Outer Protection Zone), 2c (Subsurface Activity) and 3 (Total Catchment) are situated to the south east beyond Quemerford, however.

Rest of the HMA - while there are rural areas in the HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Area, there are also plenty of areas in the countryside where development could occur without proposing a risk to water resources.

DAQ 2: Direct development to sites where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available?

At **Malmesbury**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets at **Devizes** to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a major probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Melksham**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There may be some issues at Melksham relating to site capacity and land availability. There is a major probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets at **Calne** to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There may be some issues here relating to site capacity and land availability. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Corsham**, Wessex Water have outlined scheduled investments into the local water network during 2019/20 to increase capacity, but there are no plans for investment beyond this. There is a no probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Chippenham**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Rest of the HMA - rural development is likely to be more dispersed which may mean that the existing drainage infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. However, there may be a cumulative effect on the rural system. Furthermore, if the rural development is not dispersed it could lead to requirements to upgrade capacity outside of the main settlements which has not yet been accounted for.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Rolling forward the Core strategy would result in a low level of growth at Calne. However, there is limited scope to invest in the local water network beyond 2025. As there is a moderate probability that growth would require new works a minor adverse effect is likely.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower quantum of growth for Calne. Despite this, a need to invest in the local water network remains apparent. Therefore, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower quantum of growth for Calne. Despite this, a need to invest in the local water network remains apparent. Therefore, it is likely that there will be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	A need to invest in the local water network has been identified at Chippenham. Additionally, growth would have to manage effects on water protection areas at the settlement. It is likely that this level of development, particularly considering Chippenham's location within SPZ, will have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	Strategy CH-B significantly increased the level of growth proposed at Chippenham. Additional development would create opportunities for investment into the local water network, but it would also increase the probability of effects on water protection areas. It is likely that this level of development, particularly considering Chippenham's location within SPZ, will have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	Strategy CH-C proposes a similar level of growth at Chippenham when compared to CH-A. It is likely that this level of development, particularly considering Chippenham's location within SPZ, will have moderate adverse effects against this objective.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse

Corsham	There are works planned at Corsham to improve the local water network. However, the settlement is subject to a large amount of water protection areas. Although works are set to be undertaken to increase the capacity of the local water network, it is likely that further investment would be needed to manage the level of growth proposed by this strategy. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Corsham when compared to the roll forward. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of growth at Corsham when compared to the roll forward. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Devizes	There is a major probability that growth at Devizes would require investment into the local water network. The edge of the settlement is not subject to water protection areas. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of housing at Devizes. As there is a need to invest in the local water network, it is likely that growth would lead to a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of housing at Devizes. As there is a need to invest in the local water network, it is likely that growth would lead to a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Malmesbury	There is a lack of future investment proposed for the local water network in Malmesbury and growth at the settlement could result in an effect on drinking water resource zones. The roll forward proposes a moderate level of housing for Malmesbury. It is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of housing at Malmesbury. As there is a need to invest in the local water network, it is likely that growth would lead to a minor adverse effect.	Strategy CH-C proposes a lower level of housing at Malmesbury. As there is a need to invest in the local water network, it is likely that growth would lead to a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Melksham	Investment to increase capacity of the water network is very likely to be required at Melksham, however, expanding existing assets may be difficult. The roll forward proposes a moderate level of growth at Melksham. As a result, it is likely that there would be a minor adverse impact.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward of the Core Strategy. As the need to investing the local water network remains, a minor adverse effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a higher level of growth when compared to the roll forward of the Core Strategy. As the need to investing the local water network remains, a minor adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This proposes the equivalent to the roll forward and therefore the degree of effect is likely to be similar.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This strategy proposes a slightly lower level of growth than the roll forward and is therefore likely to have a lesser effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse

Overall HMA score	-1.3 Due to uncertainties at this stage regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. However, due to the high level of water protection in Malmesbury and the level of growth proposed there in this strategy, a minor adverse effect on SA objective 3 is considered likely.	-1.1 Due to uncertainties at this stage regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. As a result, due to the presence of Drinking Water Safeguard Areas and Source Protection Zones and the potential for strain on the water network, as well as opportunities for mitigation, across the HMA, a minor adverse effect on SA objective 3 is considered likely.	-1.1 Due to uncertainties at this stage regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. As a result, due to the presence of Drinking Water Safeguard Areas and Source Protection Zones and the potential for strain on the water network, as well as opportunities for mitigation, across the HMA, a minor adverse effect on SA objective 3 is considered likely.
--------------------------	---	--	--

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategies CH-B and CH-C are the most sustainable options against this HMA. Minor adverse effects are considered to be likely across the HMA for both of these options, particularly given that growth will enable investment opportunities where they are considered to be necessary, but in taking account of potential effects on water protection areas.

CH-A is the least sustainable option, as moderate effects are likely at Malmesbury. This is the only location where moderate effects have been assessed across the HMA for this objective, due to the vast amount of water protection areas around the settlement and the need for future investment into the local water network suggests that achieving mitigation may be problematic.

Given the scale of growth at Chippenham, moderate adverse effects are likely for all strategies, with mitigation problematic but achievable.

There are areas in the HMA which lie within Source Protection Zones and Drinking Water Safeguard Areas which would need to be considered if development was allocated in those areas. Furthermore, additional development beyond what is already planned for may require further investment in infrastructure, although until sites have been allocated it is difficult to know whether capacity issues will already have been addressed by planned improvements or whether further works will be required.

Source Protection Zones have been identified within and adjoining the settlement boundaries of Chippenham, Malmesbury and Corsham. Malmesbury is considered particularly constrained with regards to water protection designations as it lies within a Source Protection Zone 1 and is therefore predicted to anticipate a moderate adverse effect for Strategy CH-A.

With regards to investment in infrastructure, development in the rural area is most likely to require additional investment as Wessex Water's planned improvement works are focused on the towns. As a result, development in the Rest of the HMA poses a risk ensuring capacity of the water network.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4: Improve air quality and minimise all sources of environmental pollution

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Minimise and, where possible, improve on unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration?

At this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options with relation to noise, light pollution, odour and vibration. Although, any level of development is expected to have a degree of effect, it is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and therefore no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

Despite this, there is a risk that across the HMA and particularly within the Rest of the HMA, allocated growth may place development in locations where increases in pollutants such as noise and light may occur where this is not currently an issue.

DAQ 2: Minimise effects on and where possible improve air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality (such as AQMAs)?

A long standing AQMA for annual average exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide is present within Devizes. Levels of Nitrogen Dioxide continue to be monitored by 7 diffusion tubes and a new junction scheme was implemented in 2018.

Calne has a long standing AQMA for annual average exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide. Levels are currently being monitored in 4 locations.

Melksham has been highlighted as a potential AQMA declaration location due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. There are currently three diffusion tubes monitoring levels in Melksham.

Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. Chippenham continues to be monitored for exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide and commitments to improving air quality form part of the Air Quality Strategy.

No AQMAs have been identified at **Malmesbury** and **Corsham**. These two settlements are understood to be lower risk with regards to air quality and are not highlighted as being locations of immediate air quality concern. However, these settlements continue to be monitored for Nitrogen Dioxide exceedance levels.

Development in the **Rest of HMA** is unlikely to have a moderate/major effect on any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in these areas, development may lead to an increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles.

DAQ 3: Lie within a consultation risk zone for a major hazard site or hazardous installation?

Consultation risk zones have not been considered for this high-level stage of appraisal. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage, but are expected to be covered at lower level stages.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Due to the occurrence of a declared AQMA it is likely that rolling forward the Core Strategy would lead to a moderate adverse effect.	This strategy proposes less growth when compared to the roll forward. Effects would therefore be lessened, but there will also be less opportunity for mitigation. It is likely that there will be a moderate adverse effect.	This strategy proposes less growth when compared to the roll forward. Effects would therefore be lessened, but there will also be less opportunity for mitigation. It is likely that there will be a moderate adverse effect.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The level of growth in this strategy is likely to have a range of adverse effects on environmental pollution, including air quality, noise and light pollution.	Strategy CH-B proposes a higher level of growth and is therefore more likely to have an effect against this objective when compared to the roll. However, a higher scale of growth may create higher probability of mitigating effects.	Strategy CH-C proposes a similar level of growth to the roll forward. Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The level of growth in this strategy is likely to have a range of adverse effects on environmental pollution, including air quality, noise and light pollution.

	Moderate adverse effects considered likely.		Moderate adverse effects considered likely.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Corsham	A moderate level of growth is proposed for Corsham, where no AQMAs have been identified. Corsham is lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as a location of immediate air quality concern. Proposed levels of growth are lower in relative terms. Growth of this scale at Corsham is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution and this is likely to be minor adverse with mitigation considered to be achievable.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Corsham. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is like that there would be a minor adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Corsham. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is like that there would be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Devizes	The WCS roll forward carries with it an increased risk of deteriorating the air quality within an area already identified as a concern. Given the required mitigation measures to improve air quality/ minimise impacts remaining unclear, it is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Devizes. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Devizes. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	A moderate level of growth is proposed for Malmesbury, where no AQMAs have been identified. As growth at Malmesbury could create issues where they are not currently apparent but could also include approaches to minimise effects a minor adverse effect is considered likely.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Malmesbury. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Malmesbury. While risks of creating air quality issues remain, so do opportunities to mitigate the effects of future development. It is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is subject to monitoring and is a potential location for the declaration of an AQMA. The Core Strategy roll forward proposes a moderate quantum of growth at Melksham and would be likely to lead to a moderate adverse effect.	Strategy CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Melksham. In the face of opportunities to mitigate effects and due to the risk of an AQMA declaration a moderate adverse effect is likely.	Strategy CH-C proposes a higher level of growth when compared to the WCS roll forward. Due to the risk of an AQMA declaration and uncertainties with relation to mitigation, a moderate adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	The level of development proposed in the rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away	There is a relatively low, but comparatively high level of growth proposed in Rest of HMA by this	This strategy proposes a low level of growth in relative terms, but this is high in comparative terms. The level of

	<p>from many of the county's existing AQMAs and therefore is less likely to have a moderate adverse impact upon any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas of the rest of the HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. With this in mind, growth in these locations is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.</p>	<p>strategy. The level of development proposed in the rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away from many of the county's existing AQMA and therefore is less likely to have a moderate adverse impact upon any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas in rest of HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. With this in mind, this level of growth in these locations is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective. This strategy proposes the equivalent of CH-A and would therefore be likely to have a similar degree of effect on rural areas.</p>	<p>development proposed in the Rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away from many of the county's existing AQMA and therefore is less likely to have a moderate adverse impact upon any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas in rest HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. With this in mind, this level of growth in these locations is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective. This strategy proposes a higher level of growth and could therefore lead to more negative effects in rural areas than the roll forward option.</p>
	<p>Likely effect: minor adverse</p>	<p>Likely effect: minor adverse</p>	<p>Likely effect: minor adverse</p>
<p>Overall HMA score</p>	<p>-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective. This is as strategy CH-A places higher levels of development at Devizes and Melksham, which are locations that are either designated AQMAs or have been highlighted as being close to declaration. With this in mind, along with the unknown extent to which the development planned in these and other locations of concern is going to be mitigated, for both air quality and other possible pollutants.</p>	<p>-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective. This is as strategy CH-B places a high level of growth in Chippenham, along with a moderate level of growth proposed at Devizes. With Chippenham being identified as being at risk of AQMA declaration and Devizes having a long standing AQMA, these distributions would place growth in areas of concern. With this in mind, along with the unknown extent to which the development planned in these and other locations is going to be mitigated, for both air quality and other possible pollutants has determined that adverse effects are likely.</p>	<p>-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective. This is as strategy CH-C places a proportionately high level of growth in Melksham, which acts as the focus for growth, along with a proportionately high level of growth in Devizes. With Melksham being identified as being at risk of AQMA declaration and Devizes having a long standing AQMA, these distributions would place growth in areas of concern. With this in mind along with the unknown extent to which the development planned in these and other locations is going to be mitigated, for both air quality and other possible pollutants.</p>

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-B is considered the most sustainable strategy as minor adverse effects are likely overall against this objective.

Strategies CH-A and CH-C are considered the least sustainable strategies as moderate adverse effects are likely overall against this objective.

There is a risk of significant adverse effects at individual settlements through each of the proposed options. All options are expected to have likely moderate adverse effects at Calne and Devizes, where existing AQMA declarations are apparent, suggesting mitigation measures may be more problematic.

Through CH-A and CH-C Melksham is likely to experience moderate adverse effects as a result of higher level of housing and employment growth in an area where an AQMA declaration is anticipated.

Additionally, all strategies suggest moderate adverse effects at Chippenham where an AQMA declaration is also considered to be anticipated and additional housing and employment growth could be critical. Opportunities to mitigate effects remain uncertain at this stage.

Development at Calne and Devizes, where there are existing AQMAs, and at Chippenham and Melksham, which have been highlighted as potential AQMA declaration locations due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide, are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects where mitigation would be problematic

All development strategies lead to significant additional development and are therefore likely to lead to increased air, noise and light pollution, particularly at Chippenham and Melksham which would receive significant growth levels through certain strategies

As the areas of poor air quality in Wiltshire are all traffic related, new development should contribute to improved air quality through reducing the need to travel by private car, promoting sustainable transport solutions and locating housing development in sustainable locations

With regards to other forms of environmental pollution, these are generally the result of urban development. Specific locational policies can ensure that development is directed to the most appropriate locations where air quality, noise and light pollution could be avoided or kept to a minimum

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Promote the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy?

For appraisal at subsequent, more detailed / site-specific SA stages

DAQ 2: Be located within flood zone 2? If so, are there alternative sites in the area that can be allocated in preference to developing land in flood zone 2? (To be determined through the application of the Sequential Test)

For appraisal at subsequent, more detailed / site-specific SA stages

DAQ 3: Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Fluvial flood-risk, along with surface and groundwater flood risk form part of the settlement-level analysis below. The cumulative impact of development was also considered in order to identify those catchments where an increase in flows as a result of growth would have the greatest impact on downstream flood risk. This analysis is based on a strategic assessment of flood risk. Local knowledge will be applied when specific development locations are identified. In terms of flood-risk potential at settlements the following can be stated:

Chippenham is at moderate risk of river, surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Melksham is at high risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Devizes is at low risk of river and surface water flooding and at high risk of groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as low.

Calne is at moderate risk of river and groundwater flooding and at high risk of surface water flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Corsham is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Malmesbury is at moderate risk of river flooding, at high risk of surface water flooding and at low risk of groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as low.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Calne is at moderate risk of river and groundwater flooding and at high risk of surface water flooding. Calne has a moderately high level of development proposed under this scenario. Any new growth would need to take into account the surface water flooding experienced across the town. Moderate adverse effects are identified as a result.	Calne has a substantially reduced level of development proposed under this scenario, notably vis-à-vis Core Strategy Continued. Any new growth would need to take into account the surface water issues experienced across the town. Minor adverse effects are identified here as a result.	This strategy proposes a similar level to the Core Strategy roll forward, the level proposed is lower. Due to existing surface water issues a Calne, it is likely that there would be a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham has some areas of flood risk. Whilst the quantum directed at Chippenham under Core Strategy Continued is moderately high it is believed that proposed growth levels could be accommodated. Therefore, minor adverse effects are indicated.	Chippenham is at moderate risk of river, surface water and groundwater flooding. Levels of growth proposed under this strategy are significantly higher and therefore flood risk significantly greater, depending on the location of any new development. Cumulative impacts from various development locations is also higher. Moderate adverse effects likely overall.	Chippenham under this development scenario would receive a reduced quantum of growth, slightly less than but rather similar to Core Strategy Continued. Whilst all flood typologies demonstrate moderate risk levels, minor adverse effects are indicated for this settlement.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	Corsham is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Whilst all flood risk typologies are	Corsham has areas that are moderately susceptible to surface and groundwater flooding. Levels of development indicated at the town under	Alternative strategy CH-C proposes relatively high levels of development in Corsham, roughly commensurate with those under Core Strategy Continued, where greatest flood

	present, none is at high risk, rendering growth comparatively more feasible here under this objective, with minor adverse effects likely as a consequence.	this scenario, suggest minor adverse effects against this objective.	risk concerns are associated with ground and surface water. This level of development would lead to minor adverse effects on this objective at the town.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Core Strategy Continued proposes the greatest amount of development in Devizes of any strategy. The town has areas of groundwater flooding which development is recommended to avoid. Given that specific growth locations are as yet unknown, likely moderate adverse effects could accrue to the town.	Strategy CH-B proposes a moderately high level of development in Devizes, albeit less than in other scenarios, and substantially less than under Core Strategy Continued. Much of the settlement is at risk from groundwater flooding, and growth would need to avoid these areas. Given that specific sites for development are as yet unknown, moderate adverse effects are estimated at the town.	There is also a moderately large amount of development directed to Devizes, albeit fairly similar to those proposed under Core Strategy Continued. The town is at notable risk of groundwater flooding thus, since there are as yet no indications as regards site-specific development, likely moderate adverse effects are anticipated to accrue at this locality.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	In Malmesbury there are areas that are at risk of surface water flooding, moreover any development that does take place should carefully consider River Avon-related impacts. Moderate adverse effects are therefore noted at this settlement as CH-A distributes a comparatively higher amount of development to Malmesbury.	Malmesbury meanwhile has numerous areas of land at risk especially of surface water flooding. Whilst proposed growth is less than half of that under Core Strategy Continued, given that specific development locations are as yet unknown, minor adverse effects are indicated.	In Malmesbury, where proposed growth is similar to that under CH-B, there are large areas of land at risk of groundwater flooding. Minor adverse effects are thus suggested.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is at high risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. With specific development locations not known this leads to moderate adverse effects likely at the town.	As regards Melksham there are vulnerabilities associated with the potential for especially fluvial flooding. Given the proposed lower growth quanta under scenario CH-B, minor adverse effects are considered likely for the town.	Melksham has its highest level of growth proposed under CH-C. The town possesses some areas of flood risk, mainly fluvial due to the course of the River Avon, but moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. As a result, moderate adverse effects are estimated here.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, are moderately high and therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which can only be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, conserve the moderately high levels proposed under Core Strategy Continued, and are therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which can only be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, are moderately high, and therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which can only be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.

	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 Core Strategy Continued exhibits likely moderate adverse effects overall, with moderate adverse effects considered likely in Calne, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham.	-1.3 The overall judgement for this strategy is minor adverse effects. There are less settlements where significant adverse effects are likely – namely Chippenham and Devizes.	-1.3 Likely minor adverse effects are likely overall. There are less settlements where significant adverse effects are likely – namely Calne, Devizes and Melksham.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategies CH-B and CH-C are considered to be the most sustainable strategies. Significant effects are likely in Chippenham and Devizes through CH-B and Devizes and Melksham through CH-C.

Strategy CH-A is considered the least sustainable option. Significant effects are considered likely in four settlements. These are Calne, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham.

Whilst all areas across Chippenham HMA demonstrate some areas at risk of flooding, some places are more constrained than others. Alternative strategy CH-B, which focuses on Chippenham, offers the best opportunities to achieve flood-resilient development and mitigation.

Devizes is particularly constrained by groundwater flood-risk, which limits the areas of the settlement that might be suitable for further growth. This leads to an outcome of there being likely moderate adverse effects at the town. CH-A proposes more substantive growth at Devizes and is more likely to result in moderate adverse effects when compared to the other strategies.

Calne, Melksham and Malmesbury also perform less strongly under this objective. This notwithstanding, these settlements tend to offer greater resilience under this objective via strategy CH-B, which directs reduced growth levels to these places.

In all instances, in order to provide climate change adaptation and mitigation and improve flood resilience, new development must incorporate green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment informs application of the sequential test and, if needed, the exception test.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6: Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Conserve and enhance World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks & Gardens, sites of archaeological interest, undesignated heritage assets and their settings?

Whilst this level of analysis makes some reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, these will be appraised in more detail, where necessary, at site-specific stage. Assets of note at this stage at/around the settlements include the following:

Chippenham: assets include the registered park at Corsham and garden at Sheldon, Rowden conservation area and archaeology west of the A350. Also, assets associated with the manorial landscapes to the south of the town and vernacular stone villages to the north.

Melksham: assets are the Spa and Woolmore Manor (and their settings) to the south-east of the town and Beanacre Manor to the north.

Devizes: assets include the Castle scheduled monument & town conservation area and their setting, Roundway Down Battlefield, Caen Hill Locks and the Kennet & Avon Canal.

Calne: assets include parkland such as Bowood Park, the scheduled moated site at Pinhills Farm and medieval settlements at Beversbrook and Quemerford.

Corsham: assets include relict former estate parkland to the north and east including the registered park and garden at Corsham Court. Also surrounding conservation areas at Pickwick, Neston, Easton and Gastard.

Malmesbury: assets include the Abbey, St Paul's bell tower spire and the town conservation area and their settings.

DAQ 2: Maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements through high quality and appropriate design, taking into account the management objectives of Conservation Areas?

Whilst this level of analysis makes some reference to historic landscape character and townscape quality, design and conservation areas will feature more strongly in subsequent, more detailed / site-specific, appraisal.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Calne is subject to several heritage constraints, including assets associated with the agrarian economy, River Marden and canal and railway. This level of growth is likely to lead to a minor adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth, suggesting that there are more opportunities to avoid effects on assets at the settlement. A likely minor adverse effect is considered.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth, suggesting that there are more opportunities to avoid effects on assets at the settlement. A likely minor adverse effect is considered.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham is subject to several assets at risk these include registered parkland, conservation areas and archaeology. Given that development locations are unclear minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	This strategy focuses development at Chippenham, significantly increasing upon the level of both housing and employment growth proposed by CH-A. As a result, accommodating new development is comparatively more challenging. There are less opportunities to avoid effects on assets particularly those at risk at the settlement. A moderate adverse effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a similar level of growth to the roll forward and it is therefore considered that a similar minor adverse effect on this objective is likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Corsham	Growth levels would be challenging for heritage in and around Corsham. In addition to the heritage highlighted above, of additional note here and requiring protection would be relict parkland. Given the above, the growth quantum directed	Whilst proposed development levels would be challenging to accommodate at Corsham it is believed that, under this scenario, there may be more opportunities to direct development away from protected historic assets. A moderate adverse effect is likely.	CH-C proposes a reduction on CH-A and would also be challenging for heritage in and around Corsham. However, there may be more opportunities to mitigate effects through this strategy. On the basis of the above, moderate adverse effects are therefore likely due to heritage assets and their settings in and around Corsham.

	towards Corsham through CH-A is likely to have moderate adverse effects.		
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Devizes	Growth levels would be challenging for heritage in and around Devizes. Given the heritage assets in and around Devizes, CH-A is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	Given the heritage assets in and around Devizes and that this strategy proposes a decrease when compared to CH-A, it is considered likely to have minor adverse effects.	Given the heritage assets in and around Devizes and that this strategy proposes a decrease when compared to CH-A, it is considered likely to have minor adverse effects.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Challenges with relation to this objective are considered at Malmesbury. Moderate adverse effects are likely as a result of this level of growth.	This strategy proposers a lower level of growth at Malmesbury when compared to the roll forward. As challenges are apparent a minor adverse effect is considered.	This strategy proposers a lower level of growth at Malmesbury when compared to the roll forward. As challenges are apparent a minor adverse effect is considered.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is considered to be less constrained than other settlements within the HMA against this objective. At this level of assessment, opportunities to direct development away from protected assets are considered and a minor adverse effect is likely.	As this strategy looks to propose a lower level of growth at Melksham, when compared to the roll forward. A minor adverse effect is considered likely.	Although this strategy looks to focus development in Melksham, increasing on the quanta of housing and employment development proposed by the roll forward, given that there are limited historic environment constraints at Melksham a minor adverse effect is considered likely.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Under this strategy development rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The nature of heritage assets distribution in the rural area means that such growth locations would have to be selected carefully. Overall, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.	Under this strategy development rates in Rest of HMA are the same as CH-A. The nature of heritage assets distribution in the rural area means that such growth locations would have to be selected carefully. Overall, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.	Development rates in Rest of HMA under this strategy are higher than CH-A and CH-B. However, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse

Overall HMA score	-1.4 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have minor adverse effects overall on this objective.	-1.3 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have minor adverse effects overall on this objective.	-1.1 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have minor adverse effects overall on this objective.
--------------------------	---	---	---

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategies CH-B and CH-C are the most sustainable options as likely to have fewer adverse effects overall. There is a likelihood of significant effects at Corsham through both of these strategies and at Chippenham through CH-B.

Strategy CH-A is the least sustainable option as likely to have more adverse effects overall. Significant effects are considered likely at Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury through this strategy, thus a more severe effect is anticipated across the HMA as a whole as a result of this strategy.

Recommendation - a key recommendation of this SA is to explore an additional development strategy that would reduce prospective development levels in/around the more constrained settlements of Malmesbury, Corsham and Devizes. Such a strategy could increase the growth at Melksham, Calne and Chippenham which are relatively unconstrained in heritage terms but also in environmental terms more generally. Strategy CH-B does direct substantial growth to Chippenham indicating moderate adverse effects on heritage assets in/around that locality. It is possible that mitigation would, at site-specific level, be able to reduce and mitigate these significant adverse effects through careful site selection and sensitive site design and layout.

Under strategy CH-C, the greatest comparative growth is directed towards Melksham, which represents a sustainable option as Melksham is relatively unconstrained in heritage terms. However, the same strategy proposes marginally higher levels of growth than under CH-B for Malmesbury, Corsham and Devizes, which will increase the likelihood of significant adverse effects.

Overall, Chippenham, Melksham, Calne and the Rest of the HMA offer the greatest scope for accommodating higher levels of development proposed under this objective.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7: Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance nationally designated landscapes and their settings and locally valued landscapes?

Whilst this strategic-level analysis appraises designated and locally-valued assets, local ones will become even more prominent during detailed / site-specific SA. Principal assets of note at the settlements are as follows.

Chippenham: The area has Spye Parklands special landscape area, along with three registered parks and gardens (Spye, Bowood House and Corsham Park) that in particular would need to be taken into consideration. Westwards lies the Cotswold AONB.

Melksham: the principal asset is Spye & Bowood Parklands special landscape area, to the north-east.

Devizes: particular assets include the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Calne: North Wessex Downs AONB and Bowood registered park and garden are both in the wider vicinity.

Corsham: most notably Cotswold AONB and special landscape area, Corsham Park and other locally-valued land.

Malmesbury: most notably The Abbey, the surrounding landscape context and, westwards, also the setting of Brokenborough and Cotswold AONB.

DAQ 2: Protect rights of way, public open space and common land?
 These features will be assessed in greater detail in successive rounds of sustainability appraisal when the analysis becomes more detailed.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	While the North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west, there are no local landscape designations at the settlement. A minor adverse effect is likely.	CH-B proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A. While the North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west, there are no local landscape designations at the settlement. A minor adverse effect is likely.	CH-C proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A. While the North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west, there are no local landscape designations at the settlement. A minor adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	Through this development strategy relatively less harm is likely to accrue to the Chippenham area, where proposed levels of development would be moderately challenging to accommodate. Minor adverse effects are indicated.	This strategy proposes a significant level of housing and employment growth. The uplift in the quantum of development suggests impacts would be increased. Moderate adverse effects are likely.	This strategy proposes a similar level of growth to the roll forward of the WCS. Effects will be similar as a result. A minor adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Corsham	Corsham is subject to more constraints in landscape terms. This level of growth would likely result in a moderate adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Corsham. Due to constrained nature of the settlement a moderate adverse effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the roll forward of the Core Strategy. Due to constrained nature of the settlement a moderate adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse
Devizes	Devizes is subject to some constraints in landscape terms, including landscape designations. It is possible that development of this scale could be directed away from constrained locations. A minor adverse effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A and a lower level of growth suggests that development could be located away from constrained areas. This level of growth is likely to lead to a minor adverse effect.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A and a lower level of growth suggests that development could be located away from constrained areas. This level of growth is likely to lead to a minor adverse effect.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse

Malmesbury	The setting of Malmesbury is especially dominated by its hilltop Abbey. In addition, the historic town core needs to retain strong connections with countryside along river valleys from outlying countryside. Cotswolds AONB lies adjacent to the existing urban edge of the town to the west and south. Given this reduced quantum of growth, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A. Given the constraints of the settlement, a minor adverse effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than CH-A. Given the constraints of the settlement, a minor adverse effect is likely.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is less constrained. This level of development is likely to have minor adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth. This suggests that any effects could be minimised by directing development away from sensitive landscape areas. A minor adverse effect remains likely.	This strategy proposes a higher level of growth at Melksham. The settlement is fairly unconstrained in landscape terms. A minor adverse effect is likely as a result.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are higher than CH-A and CH-B. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.3 Minor adverse effects are considered likely for the strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	-1.4 Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	-1.3 Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.
Conclusions/Recommendations:			

Strategies CH-A and CH-C score equally and are the most sustainable options as they will have fewer adverse effects overall. However, significant effects are likely at Corsham and in rural areas settlement through each of these options.

Strategy CH-B is the least sustainable option in landscape terms as it will have greater adverse effects overall. In addition to significant effects at Corsham and in rural areas, CH-B is likely to lead to moderate adverse effects at Chippenham where a higher level of development is proposed.

Recommendation: A key recommendation would be to generate an additional development strategy that would direct lower levels of development to Corsham and Malmesbury which are the most constrained in landscape terms, and direct a proportionately higher level of growth towards the less constrained settlements of Calne, Chippenham and Melksham. Such a strategy would direct growth to Chippenham at rates midway between current strategies CH-B and CH-A/CH-C, with potentially higher levels of growth potential at Melksham and Calne.

The most constrained settlement in landscape terms is Corsham which has Green Belt to the west of Rudloe, the Cotswolds AONB in close proximity to the north and west, a special landscape area, Corsham Park and other locally-valued land. Mitigation would include reducing the quantum of development being directed to Corsham.

Less constrained settlements are Calne, Chippenham, Devizes and Melksham which may be able to accommodate larger quanta of growth in landscape terms. In particular, Melksham has very few landscape constraints and is considered to be able to accommodate a higher level of growth than all other settlements except Chippenham

In the Rest of the HMA, the presence of large national designations (AONB), Green Belt in the western part of the area as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would need to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for all Rest of the HMA options until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise development locations.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 8: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing?

Delivery of homes in **Calne** has been above planned rates. The ratio of house price to earnings has increased to 8.07 but remains lower than the average for Wiltshire. 31% of housing delivered at Calne during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 was affordable, against a minimum target of 30%

At **Chippenham** the ratio of house price to earnings has also risen slightly but remains below the Wiltshire average. This is in spite of only 18% of all housing delivered in the area from 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 being affordable. Historic delivery of homes at the town has been well below planned levels due to delays in bringing forward sites allocated in the plan.

Housing at **Corsham** has been delivered at planned rates but only 20% of these were affordable housing. The house price to earnings ratio has risen to 11.25 which is above the average for Wiltshire. Proximity to AONB and the Green Belt to the west may be a contributing factor here.

At 8.94 the ratio of house price to earnings for **Devizes** is below the Wiltshire average. Housing completions have historically been higher than planned, resulting in affordable housing delivery at 35.5% which is above the minimum target of 30%.

The ratio of house price to earnings in **Malmesbury** continues to be one of the highest in Wiltshire at 14.13. Recent housing building has been slightly higher than planned but only 23% have been affordable against a target of 40%

Housing delivery has been above planned rates at **Melksham**, 34% of which has been affordable housing, above the minimum requirement for the area. The ratio of house price to earnings for the town is 8.3 which is below the Wiltshire average but higher than in 2008 following the trend seen nationally.

For the **Rest of the HMA** (the rural area) homes have been delivered at or above expected levels. Affordability ratios are, however, higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years, relative to higher tier settlements.

The updated housing requirement means that growth for the HMA will be higher (by approximately 7,000 homes) than the number of homes allocated for 2006 – 2026 under the WCS. Approximately 49% of this proposed housing requirement for the Chippenham HMA is already committed. However, the provision of a significant number of additional new homes could potentially make a notable contribution to the provision of affordable homes in the HMA.

SA Conclusions relate to the ability of the strategy to deliver affordable homes where they are needed and where house price to income ratios are highest.

DAQ 2: Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community?
 Developments providing a mix of house types and sizes can be delivered on small or large sites. For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 3: Deliver high quality residential development?
 High quality developments providing a mix of tenures can be delivered on small or large sites. For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options in relation to the quality of housing or mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Existing commitments would deliver just over half of the housing requirement for Calne leaving a further 560 dwellings to be identified. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne.	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Calne leaving an additional 40 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. Whilst this effectively rolls forward the WCS level of growth existing commitments would be built out within the next 10 years, meaning that there would be a low level of homes being delivered in the latter half of the plan period. For this reason, it is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a neutral effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne,	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Calne leaving an additional 185 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. Whilst this effectively rolls forward the WCS level of growth existing commitments would be built out within the next 10 years, meaning that there would be a low level of homes being delivered in the latter half of the plan period. For this reason, it is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a neutral effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne,
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: neutral	Likely effects: neutral
Chippenham	Historic delivery at Chippenham has been slow. However, rolling forward the pro-rata requirement	Under Strategy B Chippenham would be expected to deliver 8,335 dwellings from 2016-2036. Taking	Under Strategy C Chippenham would be expected to deliver approximately 5,915 dwellings from 2016-2036,

	<p>under CH-A for the town means that Chippenham would be expected to deliver 5,495 dwellings from 2016-2036. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 884 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.</p>	<p>into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 3724 dwellings. This is a substantial number of homes to be built during the plan period and would no doubt ensure a large number of affordable units, although this would depend on the demand matching what is being provided, and this not resulting in a shortfall in provision in other parts of the HMA where demand for affordable homes may be high. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a major positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.</p>	<p>significantly more than in the current WCS and marginally higher than Strategy CH-A. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 1304 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Corsham	<p>For Corsham, rolling forward the current strategy would mean an increase in housing provision to 1485 dwellings compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 1,010. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.</p>	<p>Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Corsham as for the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 565, or just over half. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.</p>	<p>Under Strategy C there would be an increase in housing provision compared to the previous plan period, slightly less than Strategy A. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 690. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	<p>Rolling forward the current WCS strategy at Devizes, would mean a significant increase to the housing requirement for the town. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 1,605 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.</p>	<p>Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Devizes as for the previous plan period. Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 870 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.</p>	<p>Under Strategy C, there would be an increase to the housing requirement for Devizes, marginally higher than Strategy CH-B. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 1,075 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would also be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	<p>Rolling forward the WCS against the housing requirements for Malmesbury for 2016-2036 would mean an increase for the plan period compared to current housing requirements. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 530 dwellings. Given the high affordability ratio and relatively low growth</p>	<p>Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Malmesbury compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 210 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be</p>	<p>Under Strategy C the housing requirements for Malmesbury 2016-2036 would mean an increase for the plan period compared to current housing requirements, marginally lower than Strategy A and marginally higher than Strategy B. Taking into account commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 300 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy</p>

	proposed, it is uncertain whether the scale of growth under this strategy would be sufficient to address the current imbalance. However, CH-A allocates the highest number of homes to the town, compared to the alternatives, and is therefore considered likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.	likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.	would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	At Melksham, rolling forward the WCS strategy against the housing requirements for 2016-2036 would mean an increase to be delivered at the town compared to housing requirements for the current plan period. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,381 homes for the town. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.	Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Melksham compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 561 homes for the town. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.	Under Strategy C the housing requirements for 2016-2036 would mean a significant increase in homes to be delivered at Melksham compared to housing requirements for the current plan period. This is significantly higher than Strategy A. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 2021 homes for the town. It is, however, uncertain whether the increase in provision would result in an over-supply of affordable homes at the town. However, it is considered that this scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a major positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive
Rest of HMA	A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in these parts of the Rest of the HMA. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,055 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	Under Strategy B the housing requirements for 2016 – 2036 would mean an increase in housing requirement of approximately 900 dwellings to be met at small and large villages. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,055 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	Under Strategy C there would be a modest increase in housing requirement compared with strategies A and B to be met at small and large villages. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,445 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor positive

Overall HMA score	1.0 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	0.9 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	1.3 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.
--------------------------	--	--	--

Conclusions/Recommendations:

All strategies are considered likely to have minor benefits against this objective. However, **Strategies CH-A and CH-C are the most sustainable options** as they will have slightly greater benefits overall with significant benefits in a larger number of settlements.

Strategy CH-B is the least sustainable option with fewer benefits likely overall. Significant effects are anticipated at Chippenham only through this strategy, but less positive outcomes are likely overall for the other settlements being considered.

To increase the benefits against this objective so that strategies are likely to have significant benefits overall, housing requirements would need to be increased significantly across a wider number of settlements.

The number of homes for Wiltshire proposed for the purpose of this assessment is greater than the latest OAN (determined by the national standard methodology) by more than 5,000 homes. The proportion of affordable homes needed has been determined on this basis to be 37%. This is consistent for each of the scenarios under consideration.

The housing need for the Chippenham HMA is notably higher than for the previous plan period and therefore the level of provision of homes under each of the strategies is more likely to have a positive effect for the overall provision of affordable homes at most of the settlements.

Strategy CH-B would have moderate positive effects at Chippenham but at the expense of adequate affordable homes provision in all of the other settlements/areas. This leads to some uncertainty as to whether this would result in the delivery of affordable homes when and where they are needed. If actual delivery of homes at Chippenham is unable to reach target rates, for example, there is no guarantee that this would be made up elsewhere within the HMA at sustainable locations.

At Calne, for strategies B and C, existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Calne leaving a very small number of dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. Existing commitments would be built out within the next 10 years, meaning that there would be a low level of homes being delivered in the latter half of the plan period. For this reason, it is considered that the scale of growth under these strategies would be likely to have a neutral effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne. This is not considered a situation that would benefit the town or its residents and a significantly higher requirement could be considered at Calne.

A better understanding of the likely delivery timescales for development at Chippenham and Melksham will be needed to determine whether the proposed levels of homes for these settlements under scenarios CH-B and CH-C are realistic and achievable within the plan period.

A rural facilities survey should be undertaken to identify where the provision of homes could be targeted to help support the vitality of rural settlements in the HMA.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 9: Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive communities with better services and facilities.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Maximise opportunities within the most deprived areas?

Within the Chippenham HMA there are areas of deprivation identified in Melksham, Chippenham and Calne. Older people are at risk of social isolation in Calne and Melksham.

Calne is currently a location where deprivation is apparent, with 6% of residents living in areas of high deprivation. Additionally, a number of children living in low-income families, the number of younger people being supported by social care and a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) are higher than the Wiltshire average.

Deprivation is apparent in **Chippenham** with 6% of the population living in areas of high deprivation.

Deprivation is apparent in **Melksham** with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. Additionally, a higher than Wiltshire average proportion of young people are living in low-income families and/or are being supported by social care.

A higher than the Wiltshire average proportion of younger people live within low-income families and are supported by CAF in **Devizes**.

DAQ 2: Be accessible to educational, health, amenity greenspace, community and town centre facilities which are able to cope with the additional demand?

Secondary schools in Chippenham are expected to reach their capacity in upcoming years, there is an opportunity to expand the Abbeyfield School. However, the school is being expanded to meet known demand and expansion is subject to PFI barriers. A substantial number of homes on a single site is likely to require the provision of a new secondary school and higher levels of growth, such as an additional 4500 homes would therefore enable a new school. Further, primary provision is also expected to be required, while emerging strategic sites are likely to bring forward additional primary provision. Chippenham has a community hospital and currently has excess GP capacity when overall capacity is considered. However, it is expected to have a GP capacity gap (-27m²) by 2026 so would require further investment in the future.

Despite a hospital being situated in **Melksham**, there is an existing GP capacity issue (-112m²), which is expected to increase by 2026 (-154m²). There is limited capacity available at Melksham Oak School, with it being expected that the school reaches capacity in the near future. Additionally, expansion is planned for the school to meet known emerging demand. Further expansion risks creating a very large school. More substantial levels of housing, in the region of 4500 homes would be able to support new secondary school provision. New primary provision has been secured and expansion is being pursued currently, but beyond this additional primary provision would have to be delivered, with around 1300 homes being able to support a new primary school.

A community hospital is situated at **Devizes** and additionally there are plans to refurbish Lansdowne GP surgery. Despite this, Devizes has the second largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG as of September 2016 (-612m²). This is predicted to increase to -820m² by 2026. There is capacity within the Devizes Secondary School to take on new students from modest levels of housing development. Some investment opportunities could be apparent at Devizes School and Lavington School. The latter of which is at capacity. There is a surplus of places among primary schools in the area and opportunities for expansion are apparent.

The NHS have identified an opportunity to support a GP surgery redevelopment in **Malmesbury**, where there are no existing GP capacity gaps identified or forecast for the future. Malmesbury Secondary School is currently undergoing expansion to meet known demand from new development and there may be limited opportunities to expand the school beyond this. Substantial additional growth could support a new secondary school provision. Opportunities to expand the PFI school could be subject to complex negotiations. Expansion of the primary school is currently being undergone and there are additional opportunities for new or expanded provision.

Corsham is in the top 10 for largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG (-283m²) in September 2016. The gap is expected to increase to -408m² by 2026. There is scope to expand the existing secondary school, but current plans being pursued to provide places for known demand from new housing. Additional expansion (upwards of 1000 homes) risks creating an extremely large school. Therefore, larger numbers of housing would require new provision. Recent expansion of Corsham Primary School has been apparent to meet known demand, although there is a small existing surplus of places. As a result, additional primary provision is expected to be required.

Calne has a community hospital and currently has excess GP capacity when overall capacity is considered. However, it is expected to have a GP capacity gap by 2026 (-79m²) so would require further investment in the future. There is capacity at John Bentley Secondary School and a further opportunity for expansion. An additional secondary school could be supported during the plan

period by substantial levels of housing at Calne, but the needs of an additional 1400 homes could be accommodated by expanding the existing school. Additional primary provision is expected to be required, while Priestly Primary school has recently been expanded to meet known demand, further expansion on of this primary school is an opportunity.

DAQ 3: Promote/create public spaces and community facilities that might support public health, civic, cultural, recreational and community functions?

For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options in relation to public spaces and community facilities. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 4: Reduce rural isolation, including access to affordable services for those without a car in rural areas?

Rural areas suffer from lack of access to services and facilities, so additional development in these areas without promoting services alongside could lead to more isolation. However, affordability is an issue in the rest of the HMA. Therefore, development in these areas could potentially address this issue. In addition, rural development is likely to have good access to green/open space.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Rolling forward the current strategy would create opportunities to invest in areas of deprivation, school provision and health services and therefore, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on this objective.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the roll forward and would be less capable of leading to positive effects through investment and mitigation. A minor positive effect is likely.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the roll forward and would be less capable of leading to positive effects through investment and mitigation. However, effects would be more positive than CH-B. A minor positive effect is likely.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	This strategy creates opportunities for investment in an area with apparent issues of deprivation and in health services. This strategy will have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. It will create opportunities for investment in an area with apparent issues of deprivation and in health services. But this level of growth is unlikely to support new school provision at Chippenham and is therefore likely to have a minor positive effect.	This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth than rolling forward the Core Strategy. This strategy is likely to support investment into areas suffering from deprivation and into health services. Additionally, this level of growth could be able to support new secondary level schooling provision. As a result, a major positive effect is likely. When compared to the roll forward it is likely that there would be more opportunities to mitigate impacts on this objective through higher levels of growth.	This strategy proposes a similar level to the roll forward and a similar effect would be likely as a result. This strategy creates opportunities for investment in an area where deprivation is apparent and in health services. A minor positive effect is likely.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: minor positive

<p>Corsham</p>	<p>There are opportunities for have some benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/ recreational facilities through this strategy, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>Due to the substantial GP gap identified and unclear opportunities to invest in both health services and school through this strategy, it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect only. It is unclear whether this strategy would be sufficient to lead to mitigation when compared to the roll forward of the current strategy.</p>	<p>Lower levels are proposed through this strategy than through the roll forward. However, it should still have some benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/ recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. Due to the substantial GP gap identified and unclear opportunities to invest in both health services and school through this strategy, it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect. It is unclear whether this strategy would be able to sufficient lead to mitigation when compared to the roll forward of the current strategy.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a lower scale of growth when compared to the roll forward. It should still have some benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/ recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. Due to the substantial GP gap identified and uncertainties with relation to opportunities to invest in both health services and schools through this strategy, it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect.</p>
	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>
<p>Devizes</p>	<p>Development at Devizes could place additional pressure on existing services and facilities. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. Devizes has the second largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG as of September 2016 (-612m²) and this is predicted to increase to -820m² by 2026. Due to opportunities to invest in health services, areas suffering from deprivation and existing school places. This level of growth is likely to lead to a minor positive effect on objective 9.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a lower level of growth at Devizes. Existing school provision could be able to support this level of growth, additionally this strategy could direct investment into areas subject to deprivation and towards local health services. Therefore, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on objective 9.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a lower level of growth in comparison to the roll forward. Due to the surplus places at schools in the area and opportunities at Devizes to invest in areas suffering from deprivation and health services, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on this objective as a result of this strategy.</p>
	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p>
<p>Malmesbury</p>	<p>There are no existing GP capacity gaps identified or forecast for the future at Malmesbury. Substantial additional growth could support new secondary school provision. Comparatively this strategy directs less development to Malmesbury</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a lower level when compared to the roll forward. The level of housing provision is so low that very few benefits would be likely for the town.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes similar levels of growth to CH-B and is therefore expected to lead to similar effects. The level of housing provision is so low that very few benefits would be likely for the town.</p>

	<p>than the other strategies. Additionally, the level of growth is relatively and proportionately low and lower than rolling forward the current strategy. Despite some uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation, this strategy is more likely to be positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. As a result, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>This level of growth would not be able to support additional educational capacity where existing issues are apparent. There are uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation, reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. It is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect.</p>	<p>This level of growth would not be able to support additional educational capacity where existing issues are apparent. There are uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation, reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. It is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	<p>Deprivation is relatively high with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. There is an existing GP capacity issue and limited capacity at Melksham Oak School. CH-A places a moderate level of growth proportionately and relatively within Melksham. There are opportunities to invest in health services and areas suffering from deprivation and benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. CH-A is considered likely to have minor positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>The level of growth proposed is lower than the roll forward. It is unlikely to create many opportunities against this objective such as investment to reduce GP gap issues and areas of deprivation and uncertainties relating to the opportunities into schooling provision. It is likely that there could be a neutral effect. Due to a lower proposed level of growth than the roll forward, Strategy CH-B is subject to more uncertainty and less scope for benefits for the town.</p>	<p>Deprivation is relatively high with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. There is an existing GP capacity issue and limited capacity at Melksham Oak School. A high level of growth is proposed when compared to other strategies. There is the opportunity to invest in health services and areas suffering from deprivation and benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. CH-C is considered likely to have moderate positive effects against this objective.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
Rest of HMA	<p>This strategy proposes relative low levels of growth in Rest of the HMA, but high levels comparatively. It is less likely that this lower level of growth will result in benefits for rural settlements. However, minor positive effects overall.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes relative low levels of growth in Rest of the HMA, but high levels comparatively. It is less likely that this lower level of growth will result in benefits for rural settlements. However, minor positive effects overall.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes higher levels of growth in the rural parts of the HMA. Development on a smaller scale in large and small villages is likely to be positive in terms of providing some affordable housing and will help improve viability of local services and facilities. The level of growth in CH-C is considered likely to have greater benefits overall than the other two strategies but still minor positive.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive

Overall HMA score	1.0 Overall, this strategy is likely to have a minor positive effect on objective 9. This is due to a risk that high levels of growth at Corsham, Melksham and Devizes could lead to pressure on local schools and GP services.	1.3 Overall, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on SA Objective 9. This is due to the focus at Chippenham, which is well served in terms of health and education, with opportunities to direct investment into areas of deprivation, education services and healthcare across the other settlements within the HMA This is despite risks of negative effects at Corsham, where GP capacity is an existing issue, and Malmesbury, where education capacity is an emerging issue.	1.1 Overall, this strategy is likely to have a minor positive effect on SA Objective 9. This is due to the opportunities presented to help overcome deprivation issues in Melksham and invest in health and education facilities across the HMA, however uncertainties remain regarding the nature of effects.
--------------------------	--	--	---

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-A is marginally the most sustainable option, although CH-C scores very similarly. Strategy CH-A tends to distribute growth across a wider range of settlements and therefore is likely to have greater benefits in more settlements.

Strategy CH-B is the least sustainable option. Less significant positive effects are anticipated. Although significant benefits would be likely at Chippenham, the strategy does not distribute growth evenly and neutral effects only would be likely at Calne, Corsham, Malmesbury and Melksham. A strategy that does not distribute growth adequately to all settlements is unlikely to have benefits in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities at those settlements with low growth provision.

New development can place additional pressures on existing services and facilities in all settlements. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.

New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.

There are opportunities within all strategies to support and improve the health and wellbeing of communities. All settlements within the Chippenham HMA, besides Malmesbury, are subject to an either existing or emerging GP gap. Additional development risks exacerbating this issue but could result in investment in services and facilities where existing issues are apparent. This investment is somewhat necessary in Melksham, Corsham and Devizes, where GP capacity issues are forecast to get worse even without any additional investment or new development.

There are existing issues of deprivation identified in Devizes, Chippenham, Melksham and Calne. Each strategy proposes growth of some level in these settlements, therefore creating opportunities for investment and provision of affordable housing where deprivation is apparent.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Promote mixed use developments, in accessible locations, that reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car?

Limited notable observations are possible at this stage in relation to this DAQ. Further consideration will be given to these matters at a later, more site specific, stage where more precise accessibility, development mix and travel options become clearer. Where observations can be made at this strategic stage, they have been made below.

Each of the main settlements within this HMA possess bus travel options to varying degrees to offer alternatives to private car travel. Rail links within settlements are not universal and are only present within Chippenham and Melksham. When looking at the rest of the HMA, many of these locations are positioned in less accessible locations than the market towns and principle settlements and may increase the reliance on the private car, often being positioned further away from many amenities or public transport services.

DAQ 2: Provide suitable access and not significantly exacerbate issues of local transport capacity (unless there is evidence that such impacts can be mitigated)?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of certain key strategic constraints at each location. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise suitability of access along with the impacts on local transport capacity. More detailed assessment may be possible at the site assessment stage where impacts along with mitigation/improvement measures may become clearer.

Calne suffers from highway network congestion, notably around Wood Street and Curzon Street, which also has an impact on the AQMA designation. This highway congestion has an impact on any services or transportation using the A4 through the town.

Hosting highway links with the A350, A4 and A420, **Chippenham** sits at the centre of a number of key highway routes that, particularly at peak hours, suffer from congestion impacting journey times. The A350 around Chippenham carries the highest volume of vehicles and HGVs on Wiltshire Primary Route Network. These key routes, particularly where they pass through the town, are constrained by pinch points caused by bridges and historic layouts.

Corsham's main highway link lies with the A4 that sits on the northern edge of the town. Congestion has been particularly highlighted at junctions on this route, having subsequent impacts of journey times.

Lying on the convergence of the A361, A342 and A360 has led to **Devizes** suffering from highway congestion that impacts travel through the town, also having a negative impact on the designated AQMA.

The transport connectivity in **Malmesbury** is largely dominated by the A429 which can become congested at peak times.

Melksham's existing transport infrastructure mainly lies with the A350 with other routes including the A3102 and A365. These routes confluence on the A350 which cause significant peak hour congestion and delays, particularly through the town.

Within the **Rest of the HMA**, links to the highway network vary as do the levels of existing transport capacity. That being said, the majority of settlements in the rest of HMA will likely be less accessible to services and increase the likelihood of increasing usage of transport corridors with lower levels of capacity.

DAQ 3: Make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of certain elements of the existing transport infrastructure in each broad location that could be utilised sustainably if growth were to take place. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise potential efficient use or impacts upon the existing transport infrastructure. More detailed assessment may be possible at the site assessment stage where the potential for utilisation or improvements to the existing transport infrastructure may become clearer.

Highway connectivity within **Calne** lies mainly with the A4 running through the town and A3102 which also runs through the town. These highway links provide bus services to the surrounding settlements. No rail option is present within Calne, the nearest option being Chippenham.

Chippenham's highway links, namely the A350, A4 and A420 offer good options for travel including bus services to the surrounding settlements, some operating from the bus station that provides a bus interchange facility within the town. Chippenham also provides one of the closest locations for access to the M4, which lies just 4 miles north. Chippenham rail station provides links on the Great Western mainline, with this station being well connected to the town centre.

In highway terms, **Corsham** is well served by the A4 providing links further afield, radiating out from this link. This link provides a basis from which bus services operate to serve Corsham, linking to surrounding settlements. No rail link is present within Corsham, the nearest link is Chippenham.

The confluence of the A361, A342 and A360 characterise the transport links present within **Devizes** in highway terms, with bus services utilising these key routes to serve the town. In terms of rail provision, Devizes does not offer strong rail links with no station present within the town while links to existing stations are currently providing well utilised options.

The A429 acts as the main highway link connecting **Malmesbury** to settlements north and south, also acting as it's link to other transport corridors. Subsequently, bus services utilise this link to provide buses to these locations. Malmesbury does not have a rail link itself, the nearest station being Kemble.

Melksham is serviced by the A350 primary route providing links to key surrounding settlements. Other routes, namely the A3102, A365 along with B routes provide links to further surrounding settlements. Bus services utilise these links to provide sustainable means to access these settlements. A railway station is present within Melksham, though services are not as extensive as those offered at the surrounding stations.

The rural nature of the **Rest of the HMA** leads to a large variance in the nature and availability of transport infrastructure, both in public transport and highway terms. Existing sustainable transport infrastructure in the rest of the housing market area is often limited due to the remote location of certain areas with in-frequent public transport services and accessibility. Efficient use of existing transport systems in these locations is consequently more likely to be constrained by the lack of current infrastructure.

DAQ 4: Provide the opportunity to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure including safe active travel?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of the existing sustainable transport provision and pedestrian environment in each broad location that provide opportunity for enhancement moving forward. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise opportunities to enhance safe active travel without knowing the spatial distribution of growth within each location. More detailed assessment should be possible at the site assessment stage where the opportunities to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure may become clearer.

Within **Calne**, the absence of a railway links means that sustainable transport enhancement would need to come from the provision of bus services. The A4 and A3102 provide the main linkages to the surrounding areas and offer opportunity to further enhance the public transport offer within Calne. Active travel is characterised by national cycle route 403 that passes through the town, with cycle connectivity offered with a direct link to Chippenham. Within the town, the town cycle network plan has been developed to display opportunities.

The railway station in combination with the bus services serving **Chippenham**, offering links to the surrounding settlements utilising the main transport routes radiating from Chippenham, provide opportunity for further enhancement of the public transport options within the town. The bus station is another opportunity to further enhance the utilisation of such services within Chippenham. In safe active travel terms, national cycle route 403 passes through the town which in combination with other links such as regional route 20, provide some options. It is acknowledged that constraints such as the river and railway line can restrict such options. The Chippenham Transport strategy does identify some key routes that can improve the pedestrian and cycle provision.

The highway link provided by the A4, and the bus services operating from this route, offer the main linkages and subsequent opportunities to further enhance bus provision to the surrounding settlements in the absence of a railway link when considering **Corsham**. In safe active travel terms, options such as the Wiltshire cycleway, national cycle route 254 and regional route 20 provide some options. Within the town, the town cycle network plan displays some opportunities and current provision.

Bus services operating on the 3 routes that confluence at **Devizes**, namely the A361, A342 and A360 provide the main opportunities to further enhance bus services operating from Devizes. The possibility to enhance rail usage is limited with no rail link or direct links to rail services present within the town. In active travel terms, national cycle route 4 passes through the town along the canal tow path. The Devizes transport strategy offers further information to enhance provision.

Bus services, namely those operating along the A429 connecting **Malmesbury** to surrounding settlements provide the main opportunity to enhance sustainable transport links to the surrounding settlements. Rail provision is not provided within the town however links to Kemble or Chippenham offer the best opportunities to enhance rail usage. Active travel at a high level is present with the national cycle route 254 and sections of the Wiltshire cycleway passing through the area. The Malmesbury town cycle network plan also highlights provision and opportunities.

Melksham, being served by the A350, A3102 and A365 does offer further opportunities for the enhancement of the public transport offer through the improvements of bus services. The rail link within Melksham also offers opportunity to further enhance rail provision within the town. Active travel options are present in the form of national cycle route 403 with route 4 following the route of the canal. The Melksham town cycle network plan further highlights provision and opportunities within the town.

Within the **Rest of the HMA** there is relatively poor cycle network provision in the rural hinterland and while settlements are connected by Public Rights of Way, the quality and visibility of these routes vary. The bus services are often limited or in-frequent, particularly in more sparsely populated rural areas, though it is acknowledged that growth of towns and villages may offer the opportunity to make some public transport services more viable to these areas.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	At Calne, a higher level of housing growth is proposed within CH-A along with some employment growth. Constraints at the settlement are apparent and when considering the level of growth, a minor adverse effect against this objective is likely.	At Calne, a much lower level of housing growth is proposed within CH-B in comparison to all other options, along with an employment allocation. This is assessed as having a likely minor adverse effect against this objective.	At Calne, similar level of housing growth to CH-B is identified, but with no employment growth. Taking account of existing constraints and the proposed level of growth, this is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.
	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse	Likely effect: minor adverse
Chippenham	While offering a comparatively wider number of possibilities to enhance sustainability of travel, future growth at this level is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective, given high levels of growth and mitigation measures will need to become clearer to combat current constraints and sustainably manage this level of growth.	Focusing development at Chippenham, both housing and employment, provides the opportunity to take advantage of key sustainable transport services. This focus however will need to show how development may mitigate current constraints including congestion and the subsequent impact on both private and public transport. Given this, focusing growth in Chippenham is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	CH-C allocates Chippenham a similar amount to the roll forward. While offering a comparatively wider number of possibilities to enhance sustainability of travel, future growth at this level is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective, given mitigation measures will need to become clearer to combat current constraints and sustainably manage this level of growth.
	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse	Likely effect: moderate adverse

Corsham	The roll forward allocates a comparatively higher level of growth to Corsham along with a small employment allocation. This is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	Under this option Corsham is currently assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	Corsham is identified to take a similar level of growth to CH-B. This is currently assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Within Devizes, growth at this proposed rate corresponds to a proportionately high level of growth for the town. This is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect largely due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to minimise negative impact on the current highway infrastructure.	Growth at this lower proposed rate is currently assessed as having a minor adverse effect at this location given the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to maximise the sustainability of future growth and associated travel and negative traffic impacts on existing roads.	Strategy CH-C also allocates a proportionately high level of growth to Devizes, similar to CH-B. This proportionately high level of growth is currently assessed as having moderate adverse effects largely due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to minimise negative effect on the currently congested highway infrastructure.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	At Malmesbury proposed levels of growth are relatively low. Further growth would need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having a minor adverse effect in this location.	At Malmesbury, while proposed levels of growth are low, further growth would still need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having minor adverse effects in this location.	At Malmesbury, proposed levels of growth are relatively low broadly in line with the roll forward. Further growth would need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having minor adverse effects in this location.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	The roll forward of the core strategy allocates a large level of housing growth to Melksham along with a small employment allocation. Currently this is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect with mitigation options to sustainably manage this level of growth, against identified opportunities and constraints, being unclear.	The lower level of growth allocated to Melksham is assessed as having a minor adverse effect with mitigation options to sustainably manage this level of growth, against identified opportunities and constraints, being unclear.	Focusing more growth, both housing and employment, in Melksham that is proposed in the roll forward offers the opportunity to capitalise on the sustainable transport options present in this settlement. This will need to be balanced against exacerbating the constraints identified in this location. This focus for growth in Melksham is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	A continuation of the current levels of growth in the rest of HMA may place growth in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to improve the availability of sustainable transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage, this level of growth in the	A continuation of the current levels of growth in the rest of HMA are proposed in CH-B, the same levels as proposed in the roll forward. When considering the rest HMA it is acknowledged that this growth may take place in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to improve the availability of sustainable	This option significantly increases levels of growth compared with CH-A and CH-B. When considering the rural parts of the HMA it is acknowledged that this may take place in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to improve the availability of sustainable transport provision and accessibility.

	Rest of HMA is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage, this level of growth in the Rest of HMA is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage; this increased level of growth in the Rest of HMA is assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects against this objective.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 The comparatively greater levels of development proposed in Devizes, Corsham, Chippenham and Melksham are the focus for growth in strategy CH-A. Calne and Malmesbury also see a comparatively large level of growth allocated to them in comparison to other options. At this stage this strategy is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	-1.1 Focuses growth in Chippenham. Devizes is allocated a moderate level of growth with the remaining settlements all being allocated proportionately lower levels of growth. This strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	-1.6 Focuses more growth in Melksham with a proportionately high level of growth also being seen in Devizes, similar to the roll forward CH-A option. Similarly, Chippenham is allocated a similar level of growth to the roll forward as are the remaining settlements in the HMA. This strategy is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

CH-B is considered the most sustainable option as it will have less adverse effects overall. Significant effects are less likely across the HMA as a whole. Moderate adverse effects are still likely at Chippenham, however, given this strategy proposes the highest quantum of growth at Chippenham. While higher levels of growth are more likely to lead to significant adverse effects, there is a higher probability of mitigation to reduce impacts against this objective.

CH-A is the least sustainable option with likely effects significantly adverse overall. Significant effects are more likely across the HMA as a whole, with moderate adverse effects being identified at Chippenham, Corsham, Devizes and Melksham.

Transport issues within the Chippenham HMA are largely focussed on trying to maximise the use and availability of sustainable modes of transport along with managing levels of congestion on strategic routes and in town centres. In the case of Melksham and Chippenham this is largely centred around the A350. This can impact upon private and public transport, as well as impacting the strategic role of key routes running through each location. Overall, the level of growth proposed across the strategies is considered likely to increase traffic levels generally, and the impact of this must be taken into consideration when considering options moving forward.

Chippenham benefits from good strategic transport links along with access to a wide range of sustainable transport services including a railway and bus station. While it is beneficial to locate development in such locations, the significance of effect for all strategies is reflective of the level of risk that comes with this level of growth in a town that has been identified as suffering from peak time congestion on some key strategic routes along with the town centre.

Growth at Melksham varies across the strategies with CH-A and CH-C seeing the largest levels of identified growth. Melksham is located on the A350 primary route which passes through the town centre which, in combination with the A365 and A3102, can cause delays on the current road layout. This congestion can impact on both private and public transport provision. Melksham does also offer the opportunity of rail travel as a sustainable travel option. It should be acknowledged that the lower levels of growth identified in CH-B may preclude the possibility of highway improvement measures that can sometimes come with greater levels of growth. Similarly, while the impacts of the relatively higher levels of growth identified in CH-A and CH-B have been identified as moderate, this is associated with the risk that comes with this level of development to a town struggling with congestion on a primary route. This uncertainty reflects that the assessment is likely to change once further detail emerges around the sustainability of development in transport terms and the mitigation possible that can vary in different locations with differing levels of development.

Significant new highway infrastructure may be necessary to enable higher levels of growth to take place in the identified settlements to varying extents depending on the exact scale and location of growth.

Mixed-use development proposals are recommended as this will help increase self-containment and reduce need to travel.

More detailed transport assessments may be necessary to understand in detail the impact of certain levels of development on settlements and communities to understand the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be put in place to improve congestion hot spots and sustainable transport provision.

It is considered key to locate development at locations that make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and can facilitate advancements in the use of sustainable transport. Therefore, favourable locations should be in well-connected areas that benefit from good accessibility to a wide range of sustainable transport options, or in locations that can facilitate improvements in such factors.

Development should contribute to improving sustainable transport networks; this includes linking town centres with development sites as well as linking settlements together. Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment may be required to improve public transport services and safe walking/cycling links, particularly within the town centres.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11: Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Support the vitality and viability of town centres (proximity to town centres, built up areas, station hub)?

The relationship with the town centre, and its immediate and wider rural context is complex and will also rely on trade from staff and other retail and non-retail businesses. Additional growth will inevitably contribute, to some extent, to the vitality and viability of town centres. At this stage, in the absence of specific site options to consider, the proximity of future housing and employment development to the town centres cannot be determined and therefore will not be considered as part of this high-level assessment but will be assessed at later stages.

DAQ 2: Provide a variety of employment land to meet all needs, including those for higher skilled employment uses that are (or can be made) easily accessible by sustainable transport?

The Local Plan Review is at an early stage of preparation and, consequently, details of the distribution and range of employment uses that will be provided is not known. Therefore, for this high-level stage of appraisal it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options against this objective. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of employment land and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 3: Contribute to the provision of infrastructure that will help to promote economic growth?

The provision of housing and employment will require sufficient infrastructure to be in place to ensure that it is acceptable. This will largely be achieved through s106 contributions for those directly related to the development. CIL funds and grant funding will ensure the provision of strategic infrastructure. The quantum of homes and employment land to be delivered is the same for each of the strategies and therefore should result in the contributions towards infrastructure on a similar scale, albeit applicable to specific areas. The provision of infrastructure will need to be considered and tested further at the site options stage.

DAQ 4: Promote a balance between residential and employment development to help reduce travel distances to work?

Wiltshire has large flows of commuters into and out of the county, with an overall net outflow of commuters. The majority of movement is to and from Swindon and Bath & North-East Somerset. 56% of people travel to work by car, 13% by foot and 5% by public transport. Self-containment in Wiltshire is 63%, compared to 74% in Swindon.

The extent that strategies can promote a balance between residential and employment development will, in part, depend on the existing provision in terms of housing stock and employment uses, the relationship between them, and the relationship/connectivity of a settlement with other parts the HMA/FEMA (which themselves are strongly influenced by travel to work areas) and adjacent areas. The provision of employment development in isolation could, for example, be more likely to lead to an increase in travel distances but not necessarily if it was located in an area of relatively higher rates of unemployment. The same might apply in areas where employment vacancies are high or jobs are expected to increase. This will, however, depend on the extent that the skills base of the unemployed in the local area match that provided by any new employers.

Of the total need of 182ha of employment land identified in the FEMA, a substantial proportion can be met from existing operational employment sites and site allocations leaving 26ha to be met from additional allocations across the county. The residual requirement for employment land for the Chippenham HMA is 9ha.

At **Chippenham** total jobs are up slightly since 2009. There is a high concentration of Public Administration & Defence jobs. Recent investments include ongoing expansion by Good Energy at Monkton Park, a new purpose-built HQ for Woods/Valldata on the last undeveloped site on the Bumpers Farm Estate, Expolink's move to a larger building at Greenways, Wincanton's occupancy of the former Herman Miller facility, and Wavin Group's major factory and stockyard expansion. There is virtually full occupancy of sites/premises, and businesses report a shortage of availability. Chippenham has low levels of unemployment. The SWLEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) identified that the A350 Growth Zone recorded the highest growth in employees amongst all growth zones in 2012-14 (27.4%). There is a very limited supply of existing employment sites and premises available for immediate take up in Chippenham and a lack of affordable sites for development. 19ha of greenfield employment land (to accommodate 50,000m² floorspace) has recently been permitted south west of Chippenham but is yet to be implemented.

At **Malmesbury** total jobs are up significantly since 2009. Wholesale & Retail and Business Services are the most highly concentrated sectors. The dominance of Dyson in the local economy is not apparent from the data, although the JSF highlights its significance. There is ongoing major investment by Dyson at its global RDD campus in the town, supporting a doubling of the workforce, including the new Dyson Academy, and through the acquisition of Hullavington Airfield with the intention to develop a second campus, for battery and new energy vehicle development, although this has not been through the planning process. There is low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates in the town. There are currently limited alternative employment sites available for businesses to locate or existing businesses to expand. The remaining allocated employment site of 1ha in size is currently in use as a garden centre.

At **Calne** total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is a high concentration of Manufacturing jobs. Deceuninck has reopened its 110,000 sq ft warehouse facility at Porte Marsh Industrial Estate to support production growth at its Stanier Road factory. Calne has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. The town has limited capacity for additional retail growth. Part of Beaversbrook employment allocation has been permitted for residential use, resulting in a reduction in available greenfield employment opportunities.

At **Corsham**, total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is a high concentration of employment in the Real Estate, and Information & Communication sectors. ICT presence is reflected in the JSF. Corsham Science Park continues to grow with Bath ASU completing a new purpose built manufacturing and R&D facility, two further buildings have been completed, and a third phase of flexible business units is planned to meet expected market demand. Ark Data Centres have continued to expand their large scale data facilities at Spring Park. The town has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. There are no outstanding employment allocations at the town although there is continued potential for the release of former MoD land to the west.

At **Devizes** total employment has steadily declined since 2009. There is a high concentration of employment in the Public Administration & Defence, Manufacturing, and Construction sectors. The potential for the Manufacturing sector also highlighted in the JSF. Recent larger investments at Hopton Road Trading Estate have included a new-build second production facility for MSA Latchways, Cross Manufacturing taking a second production building, and ongoing production expansion at Haydens Bakeries. There are low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. There is an 8.4ha greenfield employment allocation at Horton Road yet to be developed.

At **Melksham** total jobs have grown steadily since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Manufacturing. The business profile in the JSF reflects the strength of the Manufacturing sector. Recent major investments at Bowerhill include the consolidation of Herman Miller's UK manufacturing at its 170,000 sq ft purpose-built Portal Mill facility, and further warehousing/office expansion by Gompels Healthcare; and developments at Hampton Park West including the JLR dealership and hotel and food outlets. Wiltshire Air Ambulance are also constructing and equipping their new airbase located to the south of Hampton Business Park. Melksham has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	<p>Under this strategy 5ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne. This would provide capacity for employment at the town to increase, which could potentially result in reducing travel to work distances, taking into account the number of homes delivered at the town in recent years and the stagnation of employment growth over the same period.</p> <p>The higher level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. For this reason, it is assessed that the strategy would have likely moderate positive effects for the town.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 2ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne, lower than for Strategy CH-A but higher than Strategy CH-C. The housing to be allocated under this strategy is, however, lower than for both the alternative development strategies, but will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Taking into account the relatively high numbers of housing delivered in recent years and the stagnation of employment over the same period, this strategy is therefore predicted to have a minor positive effect overall and compared to Strategies CH-A and CH-C.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne. The lack of additional employment land could result in an imbalance with the number of homes delivered in recent years and to be delivered against this strategy (which is not substantially different from strategy CH-B).</p> <p>However, the level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour</p> <p>Minor positive effects likely overall.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	<p>Under this strategy, no additional employment land would be required at Chippenham. The current strategy for Chippenham is based on delivering significant job growth at the town. Given the supply of outstanding and existing commitments, rolling forward the current strategy without further allocation of employment land is considered unlikely to lead to an imbalance with the additional growth in housing.</p> <p>The significant level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted.</p>	<p>Under this strategy, 7ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Chippenham. This scenario, in combination with the additional homes also being allocated would be likely to result in significant positive effects at the town.</p> <p>The combination of 7ha employment land and a significantly increased level of housing will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide a significantly increased supply of local labour. Strategy CH-B is considered likely to have major positive effects compared to strategies CH-A and CH-C.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Chippenham. However, there would still be a relatively high level of additional employment land provided for the town from existing commitments and this level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>For these reasons a minor positive effect is likely, the same as strategy A, but benefits would be likely to be significantly less than CH-B.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Corsham	<p>At Corsham 2ha of additional employment land and an additional 1,485 homes would be allocated at the town. Employment has stagnated during recent years whilst delivery of homes has been relatively high over the same period. The level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. The allocation of additional employment land in combination with</p>	<p>Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Corsham (there are also no outstanding employment allocations at the town) and a lower amount of additional homes would be allocated which, in combination with existing commitments for homes, is predicted to have likely minor positive effects for the town. The level of housing proposed will help to support local</p>	<p>Under this strategy 4ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Corsham. Under this strategy an additional 1,165 homes (similar to Strategy B) would be allocated. The level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. This strategy would allow the potential for employment to increase, more in balance</p>

	the significant additional housing, would therefore be likely to lead to moderate positive effects on this objective.	businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.	with housing growth, and therefore result in moderate positive effects overall.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
Devizes	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed. The significant level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. A continuation of the existing strategy with the allocation of significant additional homes is therefore likely to result in minor positive effects.	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at the Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed. The lower level of housing proposed will still help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. This strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects.	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at the Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed. This level of housing proposed, similar to CH-B, will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. This strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Malmesbury. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town. There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised. This level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Consequently, this strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects.	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Malmesbury. This is the same as for Strategies CH-A and CH-C. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town. There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised. The level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Consequently, this strategy is also likely to result in minor positive effects.	Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Malmesbury. This is the same as for Strategies CH-A and CH-B. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town. There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised. The level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Consequently, this strategy is also likely to result in minor positive effects.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	Under this strategy 2ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be likely to have a positive effect, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. However, whether this would be sufficient to balance the	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham and there is a lower provision for new homes. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be likely to have a positive effect, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. This increase in employment seen in recent years	Under this strategy 5ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham and a significant increase in housing. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be a positive, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. However, as with Strategy CH-A, whether this would be sufficient to balance the growth of new homes or meet demand from interested

	growth of the significant number of new homes proposed or meet demand from interested businesses is unclear. This level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have likely minor positive effects – benefits would be greater if the level of employment proposed was higher.	may slow, however, depending on scope for expansion within existing businesses. This level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have likely minor positive effects – benefits would be greater if the level of employment proposed was higher.	businesses is unclear. This significant level of housing proposed will also strongly support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have moderate positive effects. This would be more positive compared to Strategy CH-A and Strategy CH-B.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
Rest of HMA	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-A would have minor positive effects.	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-B would have minor positive effects.	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-C would have minor positive effects.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Overall HMA score	1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.	1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.	1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.

Conclusion/Recommendations:

This assessment has considered both proposed employment and housing levels in assessing whether strategies will encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth.

Overall, strategies **CH-A, CH-B and CH-C score equally well and are the most sustainable strategies**, although significant benefits overall are not considered likely.

The moderate positive scores for Calne and Corsham for CH-A, major positive score for Chippenham for CH-B and moderate positive scores for Corsham and Melksham for CH-C have contributed to these strategies being considered the most sustainable with little difference between them in sustainability terms.

For CH-C, the distribution for Calne is considered to have negative impacts as the lack of additional employment land could result in an imbalance with the significant number of homes delivered in recent years.

Outstanding commitments in the Chippenham HMA are considered capable of meeting a significant proportion of the need for additional employment land to 2036. Consequently, the differences in the effects of the three strategic options for the distribution of the residual employment land requirement are limited by the relatively small scale of development under consideration. A key consideration has been the aspiration to reduce travel to work distances and achieve a balance between employment and housing growth.

Future employment growth at Devizes, Calne and Corsham should be balanced, commensurate with housing development. Loss of employment land in these areas should be resisted.

The level of housing proposed has also played a part in the assessment because higher levels of housing, whilst it may contribute to out-commuting if there are insufficient local employment opportunities, is also likely to help to support local businesses, town centres and rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour.

Retention of existing and allocated employment land is often challenging to manage. Consider inclusion of policies that safeguard against incompatible uses or unnecessary loss of employment sites but also set out criteria against which, in exceptional cases, an existing site or allocation that is clearly and demonstrably no longer suitable for employment development can be de-allocated or developed for an alternative use.

Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Alternative Development Strategies (Local Housing Needs Assessment)

Strategy CH-A (Current Strategy) - Rolling forward the core strategy includes employment land at Calne, Corsham and Melksham.

Strategy CH-B (Chippenham Expanded Community) - Chippenham expanded community. Melksham and the more constrained settlements of Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury all continue at WCS rates i.e. no change and continuation; and Chippenham receives the balance 9,765 homes. Includes employment at Chippenham and Calne.

Strategy CH-C (Melksham Focus) - Melksham Focus (3,950), albeit Chippenham still significant (6,930) and higher growth in Rest of HMA. Growth is diverted from more constrained places (Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury). Includes employment at Melksham and Corsham.

Proposed distribution of housing and employment requirements – Chippenham HMA						
Settlement	Strategy CH-A (Current Strategy)		Strategy CH-B (Chippenham Expanded Community)		Strategy CH-C (Melksham Focus)	
	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment
Calne	2050	5	1440	2	1610	0
Chippenham	6441	0	9765	7	6930	0
Corsham	1740	2	1220	0	1365	4
Devizes	2870	0	2010	0	2250	0
Malmesbury	1260	0	885	0	990	0
Melksham	3199	2	2240	0	3950	5
Rest of HMA	2840	0	2840	0	3300	0
TOTAL	20400	9	20400	9	20395	9

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 1: Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Avoid potential negative impacts of development on designated wildlife sites, protected species and priority species and habitats (international, national, local) and enhance these where possible?

Calne has no statutory ecological designations adjacent or nearby but there are a number of non-statutory designations. The ancient woodlands at Bowood may provide habitat for Annex II bats.

Corsham lies partially within the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC core sustenance area, with Box Mine SSSI a component of this. As well as these statutory designations, there are several CWS designations which provide some ancient woodland habitat for Annex II bat species. The railway line and parkland also provide habitat connectivity for Annex II bat species. Development in the particularly sensitive areas, such as the area to the west of Corsham between Rudloe, are likely to lead to significant pressure on Annex II bat species which may not be possible to mitigate successfully. Furthermore, lighting caused by additional infrastructure in Corsham may adversely impact Annex II bat species.

Similarly, **Devizes** contains several Annex II bat species hotspots which provide a habitat for bats associated with the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC, as well as commuting and foraging routes. This includes the area around Devizes Castle, the disused railway line, the Kennet and Avon Canal and areas of woodland including the statutory designation of Drew's Pond Wood LNR. Development on or adjacent to these areas reduces the permeability of the landscape for bats and would negatively impact Annex II bat species.

In **Chippenham**, there are several CWS designations adjacent to and within the settlement boundary, as well as the statutory designation of Mortimer's Wood LNR located to the south of Chippenham. As the LNR lies to the east of a site allocated in the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan, care will be needed to ensure that cumulative impacts from potential further development surrounding the LNR do not lead to negative effects.

While there are no statutory ecological designations adjacent to or nearby **Melksham**, there are several non-statutory ecological designations including the Bristol Avon CWS and Conigre Mead WWT nature reserve. Furthermore, the settlement contains the habitats of protected species including great crested newts to the south of Bowerhill and east of Melksham, and otters and water voles associated with the watercourses of Bristol Avon, Clackers Brook and Semington Brook. These watercourses also act as key primary connective habitats.

There are several CWS designations in **Malmesbury**, as well as the designation of Conygre Mead LNR to the east of the settlement. The River Avon also acts as a hotspot for the protected species of crayfish, otters and water vole, and acts as the main connective corridor.

Some areas in the **Rest of the HMA** are designated SSSIs, lie within the buffers of SACs, or contain important habitats including ancient woodland.

DAQ 2: Ensure that all new developments protect Local Geological Sites (LGSs) from development?

While there are no settlements in the Chippenham HMA in direct proximity to an LGS (formerly Regional Sites of Geological Importance, or RIG) there is a RIG to the north of Devizes at Oliver's Castle.

DAQ 3: Aid in the delivery of a network of multifunctional Green Infrastructure?

The design of developments may incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity and contribute to networks of multifunctional green space known as green infrastructure. The preparation of a Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy will help to provide a long-term vision and strategic framework to aid the delivery of GI. However, at this stage of the process, it is not possible to comment on the likelihood of GI being adopted as part of development.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Core Strategy continued proposes a moderately high growth quantum for Calne – marginally the highest overall. There are uncertainties regarding likely effects on biodiversity overall but given this increase in growth rates, moderate adverse effects would be anticipated.	This option proposes a level of growth that is considerably lower than CH-A and the same as currently required in the Core Strategy. Given there are few ecological constraints at Calne, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	This option proposes a level of growth that is considerably lower than CH-A and slightly higher than CH-B. Likely effects will be similar to CH-B. Given there are few ecological constraints at Calne, minor adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	This strategy would direct a comparatively lower level of growth at Chippenham than the other options, but the level is still significant. There are areas of ecological sensitivity within and on the edge of Chippenham which may be adversely affected by development. It is anticipated that development could avoid areas of sensitive biodiversity, depending on location. Overall, this strategy is likely to have moderate adverse effects on this objective.	This strategy proposes a considerably higher level of growth at Chippenham compared to other options. Therefore, additional to housing development, it is likely that significant additional infrastructure will be needed. As a result, moderate adverse impacts are considered likely against this objective. Adverse effects are likely to be more significant than CH-A and CH-C but mitigation measures are possible.	This strategy would direct a comparatively lower level of growth at Chippenham than CH-B, but the level is still significant. There are areas of ecological sensitivity within and on the edge of Chippenham which may be adversely affected by development. It is anticipated that development could avoid areas of sensitive biodiversity, depending on location. Overall, this strategy is likely to have moderate adverse effects on this objective.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	As CH-A directs a moderately high level of housing growth to Corsham, which is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species, negative effects on biodiversity at the settlement would be probable. Moderate adverse effects are therefore anticipated.	This option proposes considerably less housing growth at Corsham than Core Strategy Continued, along with no additional employment land. However, the area is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species and therefore moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	This option proposes considerably less housing growth at Corsham than Core Strategy Continued, but with 4ha additional employment land. The area is highly constrained with regards to Annex II bat species and therefore moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	Devizes contains few ecological designations in/around the town. However, due to the high level of growth in Devizes proposed in Core Strategy Continued, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects on Annex II bat species and their habitats.	This strategy proposes a growth quantum significantly less than CH-A. Effects are therefore likely to be less and Devizes contains few ecological designations in/around the town. Minor adverse effects are likely.	This strategy proposes a growth quantum significantly less than CH-A. Effects are therefore likely to be less and Devizes contains few ecological designations in/around the town. Minor adverse effects are likely.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	CH-A proposes a moderately high level of growth for Malmesbury. As a result, due to potential impacts on Conygre Mead, CWSs and the River	As CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Malmesbury compared to CH-A, and the lowest level of all alternatives in all settlements, it is	This strategy proposes a level of growth at Malmesbury more or less commensurate with CH-B. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered likely.

	Avon, and other habitats and species, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	anticipated that the proposed growth quantum might be accommodated without significantly negatively impacting on areas of sensitive biodiversity. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	While this strategy proposes a moderate level of growth to Melksham, there are few ecological designations adjacent or nearby to the town. Overall, while it is anticipated that development could avoid most areas of ecological sensitivity, this option is still likely to have some adverse effects on biodiversity.	As CH-B proposes a lower level of growth at Melksham compared to Core Strategy Continued, it is anticipated that development could avoid most areas of ecological sensitivity. Overall, this option is likely to have minor adverse effects on biodiversity in the Melksham area.	This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Melksham compared to CH-A and CH-B. Due to the level of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are therefore considered likely with mitigation problematic.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.	This option includes a significantly higher level of growth in the rest of the HMA than CH-A and CH-B. Therefore, it is more likely that development will impact on areas of biodiversity sensitivity. At this stage, no sites have been identified, but given the higher level of growth, moderate adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 Overall, given the various likely adverse effects on biodiversity highlighted from future development in the different locations, CH-A is considered likely to lead to moderate adverse effects which are considered capable of being mitigated but mitigation would be problematic.	-1.3 Overall, given the various likely adverse effects on biodiversity highlighted from future development in the different locations, CH-B is considered likely to lead to minor adverse effects which are considered capable of being mitigated.	-1.6 Overall, given the various likely adverse effects on biodiversity highlighted from future development in the different locations, CH-C is considered likely to lead to moderate adverse effects which are considered capable of being mitigated but mitigation would be problematic.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-B is considered to be the more sustainable option against this objective with the least number of settlements likely to have significant adverse effects from proposed levels of development. Corsham and Chippenham are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects with mitigation problematic, however mitigation is considered possible if careful consideration is given to the location of any new development and associated infrastructure, and a biodiversity net gain is achieved on all sites.

Strategies CH-A and CH-C score equally and are considered the less sustainable options as these are likely to result in the highest number of moderate adverse effects across all settlements/areas with mitigation problematic to achieve. These options propose the highest level of housing and employment growth at the smaller settlements of Corsham, Malmesbury, Calne and Devizes, and also at Melksham.

Recommendation - A key recommendation of this SA is to explore an additional development strategy that could reduce prospective development levels in/around the more ecologically constrained settlements such as Corsham and increase growth at settlements with less ecological constraints, such as Devizes, Calne and Melksham.

As Corsham lies within the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC, the settlement is considered to be the most at risk of any impacts on biodiversity as any additional growth, without appropriate mitigation, poses a risk to biodiversity. As a result, moderate adverse effects are likely in the settlement across all strategies.

Development in Corsham and Chippenham should avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC and on the River Avon. Reducing levels of development in Corsham, in particular, would help reduce likely adverse effects of this option.

Biodiversity issues in the Chippenham HMA are mainly focussed around protecting Annex II bat species due to the internationally designated Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC. There are also a number of local biodiversity designations (LNR/CWS/SSSI) at all of the settlements assessed and in the rest of the HMA area which have the potential to be adversely affected by development.

Where the level of growth proposed in settlements requires the development of additional infrastructure, an early decision on the location of such infrastructure will be needed to avoid fragmenting key connective habitats such as watercourses and woodland.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2: Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Ensure efficient use of land?

The design of specific developments will involve setting appropriate housing densities for development and this will be part of the planning process at a later stage. At this stage of the process, it is not possible to comment on the design and density of developments.

DAQ 2: Lead to the reuse of Previously Developed Land where possible/appropriate?

There is a lack of previously developed land (PDL) across the whole of the HMA. Therefore, all strategies are likely to result in significant loss of greenfield land.

DAQ 3: Encourage remediation of contaminated land? If so, would this lead to issues of viability and deliverability?

Across Wiltshire, some 14000 sites of potential contamination exist as a result of a range of historical land uses; 225 high priority sites have been identified as part of a prioritised approach to inspection. Currently just four sites have been determined as contaminated land and remediated. The remediation of contaminated land will be principally addressed through the planning process where former sites change their use.

DAQ 4: Result in the permanent loss of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3a)?

· The majority of the agricultural land surrounding **Chippenham** is Grade 3 (good to moderate) with areas of Grade 2 (very good) land in the north east and south, where there are also smaller areas of Grade 1 (excellent).

- **Malmesbury** is surrounded by mainly Grade 3 agricultural land with some areas of Grade 4.
- **Calne** is surrounded almost entirely by Grade 3 agricultural land, with a small area of Grade 4 to the west and some small areas of Grade 2 to the south east and north west.
- **Corsham** is surrounded entirely by Grade 3 agricultural land, with a small area of Grade 2 land to the south.
- **Devizes** is the most constrained settlement in the HMA with regards to the proportion of BMV agricultural land surrounding the urban area. While there are areas of Grade 3 land, there is also an equal proportion of Grade 1 and Grade 2 land.
- While **Melksham** has some areas of Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land surrounding the settlement, the majority is Grade 3 with some areas of Grade 4.
- While the majority of the **Rest of the HMA** is Grade 3, the south of the HMA contains a large proportion of Grade 1 and 2 land.

DAQ 5: Lead to the sterilisation of viable mineral resources? If so, is there potential to extract the mineral resource as part of the development?

The area to the south and north east of **Chippenham** is a designated Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA).

The area surrounding **Calne** to the western side and the eastern side is a designated Mineral Resource Block and MSA.

An MSA surrounds **Corsham** apart from the east which also covers some of the built-up area of Corsham.

There is an MSA extending from the north west of **Melksham** to the south west, which includes some of the north-west built up area of Melksham.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA and Mineral Resource Block at Calne, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land. As this strategy proposes the highest amount of comparative housing and employment in Calne, the risk of loss of BMV and minerals safeguarded land in the settlement is greater than for the other strategies. It is considered that moderate adverse effects are likely against this objective. Calne has a very low amount of PDL therefore the loss of greenfield land is likely.	While further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA and Mineral Resource Block at Calne, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land and impacts on the mineral resources could be avoided as this strategy proposes a lower level of housing growth proportional to the settlement. However, Calne has a very low capacity of PDL therefore the loss of greenfield land is likely. As a result, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. Nevertheless, this strategy proposes the lowest level of comparative housing growth, therefore, the risk of BMV land being lost in and around Calne is lower compared to rolling forward the current strategy.	While further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA and Mineral Resource Block at Calne, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land and impacts on the mineral resources could be avoided as this strategy proposes a lower level of housing growth proportional to the settlement. However, Calne has a very low capacity of PDL therefore the loss of greenfield land is likely. As a result, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. A lower level of growth is proposed through this strategy than CH-A and as a result this strategy is likely to have a similar effect as CH-B.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Chippenham to	Further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Chippenham to	Further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Chippenham to understand the

	<p>understand the potential loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA. It is considered likely that development could avoid some of the BMV land and significant impacts on the MSA due to proposing a lower level of growth proportional to the settlement. However, despite the lower level of growth through this option, the proposed amount of housing at Chippenham is likely to result in significant loss of greenfield land. As a result, a moderate adverse effect on this objective is considered likely.</p>	<p>understand the potential loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA. As this strategy proposes a high level of growth proportional to the settlement combined with the relatively low amount of previously developed land (PDL) available for development, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely. Furthermore, this strategy proposes the highest level of comparative housing and employment growth in Chippenham, therefore, the potential for BMV land to be affected in the settlement is greater than rolling forward the current strategy.</p>	<p>potential loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA. It is considered likely that development could avoid some of the BMV land and significant impacts on the MSA due to proposing a lower level of growth proportional to the settlement. However, despite the lower level of growth through this option, the proposed amount of housing at Chippenham is likely to result in significant loss of greenfield land. As a result, a moderate adverse effect on this objective is considered likely.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	<p>This strategy proposes a medium level of growth proportional to Corsham. As a result, while further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA at Corsham, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, there is a risk that minor adverse effects can occur as Corsham has a very low capacity of PDL so the loss of greenfield land is likely. Furthermore, this strategy proposes the highest level of comparative growth at Corsham so the risk of minor adverse effects occurring is higher compared to the other strategies.</p>	<p>While further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA at Corsham, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, this strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Corsham. However, there is a risk that minor adverse effects may occur as Corsham has a very low capacity of PDL, so the loss of greenfield land is likely. Nevertheless, this strategy proposes the lowest level of comparative housing growth in Corsham, therefore, the risk of minor adverse effects is lower compared to CH-A.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a slightly higher level of housing growth than CH-B and more employment. While further assessment is needed on any potential impacts associated with the MSA at Corsham, as well as the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, there is a risk that minor adverse effects can occur as Corsham has a very low capacity of PDL so the loss of greenfield land is likely. A similar level of growth is proposed through this strategy and as a result is likely to have a similar effect as CH-B.</p>
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	<p>While Devizes has some capacity for PDL, the scale of growth proposed in this option will require significant development on greenfield land. As this strategy proposes a high level of proportional housing growth in Devizes which has a high proportion of BMV land surrounding it, this strategy poses a risk of loss to BMV land depending on the precise location of development. As a result, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>While Devizes has some capacity for PDL, the scale of growth proposed in this option will require significant development on greenfield land. As this strategy proposes a medium level of proportional housing growth in Devizes which has a high proportion of BMV land surrounding it, this strategy poses a risk of loss to BMV land depending on the precise location of development. As a result, moderate adverse effects are anticipated.</p>	<p>While Devizes has some capacity for PDL, the scale of growth proposed in this option will require significant development on greenfield land. As this strategy proposes a high level of proportional housing growth in Devizes which has a high proportion of BMV land surrounding it, this strategy poses a risk of significant loss to BMV land depending on the precise location of development. As a result, moderate adverse effects are anticipated.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	<p>While further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Malmesbury to understand the potential loss of</p>	<p>While further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Malmesbury to understand the potential loss of</p>	<p>While further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 at Malmesbury to understand the potential loss of BMV agricultural land, it</p>

	<p>BMV agricultural land, it is considered likely that the significant loss of BMV land could be avoided. However, the very low capacity for PDL in Malmesbury combined with the medium level of proportional housing growth proposed in the settlement means that it is likely that greenfield land will be required. As a result, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. Furthermore, this strategy proposes the highest amount of comparative housing growth in Malmesbury, therefore, the risk of loss of BMV land in the settlement is greater than for the other strategies.</p>	<p>BMV agricultural land, it is considered likely that the significant loss of BMV land could be avoided. However, despite this strategy proposing a lower level of growth proportional to the settlement, a very low capacity for PDL in Malmesbury means that it is likely that greenfield land will be required. As a result, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. However, as this strategy proposes the lowest amount of comparative housing growth in Malmesbury, the risk of loss of BMV land in the settlement is lower than rolling forward the current strategy.</p>	<p>is considered likely that the significant loss of BMV land could be avoided. However, the very low capacity for PDL in Malmesbury combined with the medium level of proportional housing growth proposed in the settlement means that it is likely that greenfield land will be required. As a result, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.</p>
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	<p>Due to this strategy proposing a medium level of proportional growth at Melksham which has areas of BMV land surrounding it, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely. However, further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 surrounding Melksham to understand the potential loss of BMV land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA to the west and south of the town.</p>	<p>While further assessment at Melksham is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 to understand the potential loss of BMV land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA, this strategy proposes a lower level of growth proportional to the settlement, therefore it is considered likely that development could avoid BMV land and significant impacts on the MSA. However, as Melksham has a very limited supply of PDL, the scale of growth in this option would require development on greenfield land. Therefore, a minor adverse effect on this objective is considered likely. This strategy proposes a lower level of growth when compared to the roll forward and would therefore be less likely to lead to effects when compared to CH-A.</p>	<p>Due to this strategy proposing a higher level of proportional growth at Melksham which has areas of BMV land surrounding it, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely. However, further assessment is needed on the proportion of Grade 3a land within Grade 3 surrounding Melksham to understand the potential loss of BMV land as well as any potential impacts associated with the MSA. As this strategy proposes the highest level of comparative housing and employment growth in Melksham, the risk of negative effects occurring is greater than for the other strategies. This strategy proposes a higher level of growth when compared to the roll forward and would therefore be more likely to lead to effects when compared to CH-A.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	<p>Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and minerals safeguarded land. The majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 BMV land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield land, minor adverse effects are likely.</p>	<p>Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and minerals safeguarded land. As the majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield land, minor adverse effects are likely.</p>	<p>Due to the broad area in the Rest of the HMA, it is possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and minerals safeguarded land. However, as the majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land, further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. This option proposes a higher level of growth than CH-A and CH-B and as a result, this strategy is likely to have moderate adverse effects.</p>

		This strategy proposes the same level to rolling forward the current strategy and therefore a similar effect would be likely.	
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 As no individual sites have been assessed at this stage, it is difficult to understand how the strategy will affect this objective. However, due to the levels of growth proposed in Devizes and Melksham which have BMV land surrounding them, this strategy poses a risk of a large amount of loss of BMV land. Therefore, this strategy is likely to have a moderate adverse impact on SA Objective 2.	-1.3 As no individual sites have been assessed at this stage, it is difficult to understand how the strategy will affect this objective. However, due to the lower levels of growth proposed in most settlements, particularly in Devizes and Melksham which have BMV land surrounding them, this strategy is less likely to result in significant effects. Minor adverse effects are likely on this objective.	-1.6 As no individual sites have been assessed at this stage, it is difficult to understand how the strategy will affect this objective. However, due to the levels of growth proposed, particularly in Devizes and Melksham which have BMV land surrounding them, this strategy poses a risk of a large loss of BMV land. Therefore, this strategy is likely to have a moderate adverse impact on this objective.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-B is considered likely to have lower adverse effects across the range of settlements/areas and is the more sustainable strategy. However, moderate adverse effects are still anticipated at Chippenham and Devizes.

Strategies CH-A and CH-C are considered less sustainable strategies overall as the proposed distribution of development is likely to lead to moderate adverse effects across a wider area

There is a lack of previously developed land (PDL) across the whole HMA. Therefore, all strategies are likely to result in the loss of greenfield land and will potentially lead to the loss of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a). However, without knowing the exact location of growth and the extent of what BMV land is required, it is anticipated that at least minor adverse impacts will occur in all strategies. Further assessment is likely to be needed to distinguish between Grade 3a land and Grade 3b land.

Uncertainties also exist regarding the potential for mineral resources to be lost and the potential for remediation of contaminated land.

To reduce adverse effects against this objective, development should avoid BMV and minerals safeguarding land, where possible, brownfield land should be prioritised and higher density levels should be considered, where appropriate.

Devizes is considered the most constrained settlement in the Chippenham HMA with regards to this objective due to the high proportion of BMV land surrounding the town. Similarly, Melksham and Chippenham both have areas of BMV land surrounding them, however, these are smaller areas compared to Devizes. Chippenham is likely to have moderate adverse effects across all strategies due to the significant amount of growth proposed in all strategies.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3: Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Protect surface, ground and drinking water quality?

Malmesbury and surrounds are subject to Source Protection Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 1c (Subsurface Activity), 2 (Outer Protection Zone), 2c (Subsurface Activity) and 3 (Total Catchment).

Devizes is not affected by any water resource protection area, but Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3 are positioned to the north east of the settlement boundary.

Melksham and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection areas. Protection is given to water resources to the south west of the settlement boundary, however. These are Source Protection Zones 2c and 3c and a Drinking Water Protection Area.

Corsham is encompassed by Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. Some areas of Zone 1 are apparent to the east and south east of the settlement. A Drinking Water Protection Area (Groundwater) is positioned to the south of the settlement boundary, beyond Neston.

Chippenham is the largest settlement within this HMA and it is covered in its entirety by Source Protection Zones 2 and 2c. These extend beyond the settlement to the west, north and east.

Calne and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection zones. Source Protection Zones 1, 2, 2c and 3 are situated to the south east beyond Quemerford, however.

Rest of the HMA - while there are rural areas in the HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Area, there are also plenty of areas in the countryside where development could occur without proposing a risk to water resources.

DAQ 2: Direct development to sites where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available?

At **Malmesbury**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets at **Devizes** to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a major probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Melksham**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There may be some issues at Melksham relating to site capacity and land availability. There is a major probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets at **Calne** to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There may be some issues here relating to site capacity and land availability. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Corsham**, Wessex Water have outlined scheduled investments into the local water network during 2019/20 to increase capacity, but there are no plans for investment beyond this. There is a no probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Chippenham**, Wessex Water have identified a need to invest in water network assets to improve capacity between 2025 and 2036. There is a moderate probability that the roll forward would require construction works to accommodate development.

Rest of the HMA - rural development is likely to be more dispersed which may mean that the existing drainage infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. However, there may be a cumulative effect on the rural system. Furthermore, if the rural development is not dispersed it could lead to requirements to upgrade capacity outside of the main settlements which has not yet been accounted for.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	This strategy proposes a higher level of proportional housing growth for Calne. However, Calne is not within any SPZ. Minor adverse effects are considered likely given the additional demands placed on water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional housing growth for Calne. Calne is not within any SPZ. Minor adverse effects are considered likely given the additional demands placed on water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional housing growth for Calne. Calne is not within any SPZ. Minor adverse effects are considered likely given the additional demands placed on water, sewerage and drainage infrastructure.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth proportionate to Chippenham. Chippenham is the largest settlement within this HMA and it is covered in its entirety by Source Protection Zones 2 and 2c - these extend beyond the settlement to the west, north and east. There is a need for future investment to increase the capacity of the water network and manage any effects on water protection areas. It is likely that this level of development, particularly considering Chippenham's location within SPZ, will have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	This strategy proposes a much higher level of growth at Chippenham and is therefore likely to lead to significant pressures on the local water network and effects on areas of protection, unless investment is made into enhancing the local network. It is likely that there would be a moderate adverse effect as a result of this strategy. Furthermore, this strategy proposes the highest level of comparative housing growth and is therefore likely to have more significant effects compared to the roll forward. However, mitigation is achievable, if problematic.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth proportionate to Chippenham. Chippenham is covered in its entirety by Source Protection Zones 2 and 2c - these extend beyond the settlement to the west, north and east. There is a need for future investment to increase the capacity of the water network and manage any effects on water protection areas. It is likely that this level of development, particularly considering Chippenham's location within SPZ, will have moderate adverse effects against this objective
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	This strategy proposes a medium level of proportional housing growth for Corsham, which is subject to a large amount of water resource protections. Works are set to be undertaken to increase the capacity of the local water network. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects against this objective.	This strategy proposes lower levels of growth for Corsham, which is subject to a large amount of water resource protections. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects against this objective.	This strategy proposes a similar level of proportional housing growth as CH-B. Corsham is subject to a large amount of water resource protections. Although works are set to be undertaken to increase the capacity of the local water network, it is likely that further investment would be needed to manage the level of growth proposed by this strategy. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	This strategy proposes a higher level of proportional growth at Devizes so it is likely that investment would be required to improve capacity. Devizes is not affected by any water resource protection areas. Due to potential delays in the delivery of water infrastructure improvements and potential impacts on	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Devizes so it is likely that investment would be required to improve capacity. Devizes is not affected by any water resource protection areas. Due to potential delays in the delivery of water infrastructure improvements and potential	This strategy proposes a slightly higher level of proportional growth at Devizes than CH-B. It is likely that investment would be required to improve capacity. Due to potential delays in the delivery of water infrastructure improvements and potential impacts on nearby Source Protection Zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.

	nearby Source Protection Zones, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	impacts on nearby Source Protection Zones, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	As this strategy proposes a medium level of housing growth proportional to Malmesbury, the scale of growth proposed in this strategy may impact on this objective due to a lack of future investment in the water network and the potential impact on drinking water resources. Due to Malmesbury lying within a Source Protection Zone 1, a moderate adverse effect is likely as a result of this strategy.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Malmesbury. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects as a result of this strategy due to uncertainties regarding capacity of the water network and potential impacts on the Source Protection Zone 1. The effects of growth are considered more likely to be manageable through this strategy than CH-A.	This strategy proposes a similar level of housing growth as CH-B. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects as a result of this strategy due to uncertainties regarding capacity of the water network and potential impacts on the Source Protection Zone 1. The effects of growth are considered more likely to be manageable through this strategy than CH-A.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	This strategy proposes a medium level of proportional growth at Melksham. Investment to increase capacity of the water network is very likely to be required. Melksham and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection areas. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects from this level of growth.	While this strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Melksham, investment to increase capacity of the water network is very likely to be required. However, expanding existing assets may be difficult. Melksham and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection areas. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects from this level of growth.	This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of proportional growth for Melksham. Therefore, investment to increase capacity of the water network is very likely to be required, however, expanding existing assets may be difficult. Melksham and its surrounds are not affected by any water resource protection areas. It is likely that there would be minor adverse effects as a result of this strategy, but effects are likely to be greater than CH-A and CH-B which propose lower levels of growth.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This proposes the equivalent to the roll forward and therefore the degree of effect is likely to be similar.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This strategy proposes a higher level of growth than the other strategies, but it will be possible for development to avoid significant adverse effects on this objective.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.3 Due to uncertainties regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. However, overall, across all settlements/areas, minor adverse effects on SA objective 3 are considered likely.	-1.1 Due to uncertainties regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. However, overall, development is likely to result in minor adverse effects on SA objective 3.	-1.1 Due to uncertainties regarding the precise location of development and the potential for additional investment in infrastructure, it is difficult to assess the potential impact on water resources. However, overall, development is likely to result in minor adverse effects on SA objective 3.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Given scoring overall across the various settlements/areas, strategies **CH-B and CH-C are considered the more sustainable strategies**. Both strategies score equally across all settlements/areas.

Strategy CH-A is considered the less sustainable strategy against this objective as adverse effects will be greater and there is a higher level of growth directed towards Malmesbury.

Given the scale of growth at Chippenham, moderate adverse effects are likely for all strategies, with mitigation problematic but achievable.

There are areas in the HMA which lie within Source Protection Zones and Drinking Water Safeguard Areas which would need to be considered if development was allocated in those areas. Furthermore, additional development beyond what is already planned for may require further investment in infrastructure, although until sites have been allocated it is difficult to know whether capacity issues will already have been addressed by planned improvements or whether further works will be required.

Source Protection Zones have been identified within and adjoining the settlement boundaries of Chippenham, Malmesbury and Corsham. Malmesbury is considered particularly constrained with regards to water protection designations as it lies within a Source Protection Zone 1 and is therefore predicted to anticipate a moderate adverse effect for Strategy CH-A.

With regards to investment in infrastructure, development in the rural area is most likely to require additional investment as Wessex Water's planned improvement works are focused on the towns. As a result, development in the Rest of the HMA poses a risk ensuring capacity of the water network.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4: Improve air quality and minimise all sources of environmental pollution

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Minimise and, where possible, improve on unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration?

At this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options with relation to noise, light pollution, odour and vibration. Although, any level of development is expected to have a degree of effect, it is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and therefore no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

Despite this, there is a risk that across the HMA and particularly within the Rest of the HMA, allocated growth may place development in locations where increases in pollutants such as noise and light may occur where this is not currently an issue.

DAQ 2: Minimise effects on and where possible improve air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality (such as AQMAs)?

A long standing AQMA for annual average exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide is present within **Devizes**. Levels of Nitrogen Dioxide continue to be monitored by 7 diffusion tubes.

Calne has a long standing AQMA for annual average exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide. Levels are currently being monitored in 4 locations.

Melksham has been highlighted as a potential AQMA declaration location due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. There are currently three diffusion tubes monitoring levels in Melksham.

Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. Chippenham continues to be monitored for exceedance of Nitrogen Dioxide and commitments to improving air quality form part of the Air Quality Strategy.

No AQMAs have been identified at **Malmesbury and Corsham**. These two settlements are understood to be lower risk with regards to air quality and are not highlighted as being locations of immediate air quality concern. However, these settlements continue to be monitored for Nitrogen Dioxide exceedance levels.

Development in the **Rest of HMA** is unlikely to have a moderate/major effect on any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in these areas, development may lead to an increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles.

DAQ 3: Lie within a consultation risk zone for a major hazard site or hazardous installation?

Consultation risk zones have not been considered for this high-level stage of appraisal. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage, but are expected to be covered at lower level stages.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Comparatively, this strategy directs more development to Calne than the other strategies, although this figure is low in proportionate and relative terms, however. Currently any level of growth is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective within Calne due to the occurrence of a declared AQMA.	Comparatively, this strategy directs less development to Calne than the other strategies. Additionally, the level of growth is relatively and proportionately low. Currently any level of growth is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective within Calne due to the occurrence of a declared AQMA. This strategy proposes a lower level of growth and this suggests it would lead to less effects, but less mitigation opportunities also.	This strategy proposes a proportionately and relatively low level of growth. Comparatively, this strategy proposes a high level of growth at Calne. Future growth at this settlement needs to be sensitively managed with respects to its impacts on this designated area. Currently any level of growth is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective within Calne due to the occurrence of a declared AQMA. This strategy directs a lower, but similar level of growth at Calne and would therefore be likely to lead to a similar degree of effect.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The level of growth in this strategy is likely to have a range of adverse effects on environmental pollution, including air quality, noise and light pollution. However, it is considered that effects from this level of growth could be mitigated, depending on the location of development which is unknown. Likely effects are considered to be moderate adverse as there is currently no AQMA in place and infrastructure can be put in place to help reduce any effects.	This strategy proposes significantly higher levels of growth for Chippenham. This is higher than rolling forward the current strategy through option CH-A. The extent of mitigation measures required to minimise effects on air quality and other pollutants is unclear for this scale of growth. Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide, and this strategy could significantly increase this risk without adequate infrastructure and mitigation. Likely effects are moderate adverse with mitigation problematic but achievable.	Chippenham has been highlighted as a settlement at risk of an AQMA declaration due to rising levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The level of growth in this strategy is likely to have a range of adverse effects on environmental pollution, including air quality, noise and light pollution. However, it is considered that effects from this level of growth could be mitigated, depending on the location of development which is unknown. Likely effects are considered to be moderate adverse as there is currently no AQMA in place and infrastructure can be put in place to help reduce any effects.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse

Corsham	Corsham is lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as a location of immediate air quality concern. Proposed levels of growth are lower in relative terms. Growth of this scale at Corsham is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution and this is likely to be minor adverse with mitigation considered to be achievable. Effects of this strategy are likely to be greater than CH-B and CH-C.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth and would therefore be less likely to lead to adverse effects. However, growth of this scale at Corsham is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution and this is likely to be minor adverse with mitigation considered to be achievable.	This strategy proposes a similar level of housing growth to CH-B but with additional employment land. Corsham is lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as a location of immediate air quality concern. Growth of this scale at Corsham is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. Given that the mitigation measures and development distributions are unknown at this stage, likely effects are assessed as minor adverse.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Rolling forward the current strategy gives a proportionately high level of growth in Devizes. It therefore carries with it an increased risk of deteriorating the air quality within an area already identified as a concern. Given the above and that any new development is likely to have adverse effects on environmental pollution, and the required mitigation measures to improve air quality/minimise impacts remaining unclear at this stage the current assessment in this location for strategy CH-A would be a moderate adverse effect on objective 4.	Strategy CH-B gives a comparatively moderate level of growth at Devizes. Despite this being a low level in relative terms, it carries with it a risk of deteriorating the air quality within an area already identified as a concern. Given this, and the required mitigation measures to improve air quality/minimise impacts remaining unclear at this stage the current assessment in this location for strategy CH-B would be a moderate adverse effect.	Similar to CH-B, this strategy gives a moderate level of growth to Devizes. CH-C carries with it an increased risk of deteriorating the air quality within an area already identified as a concern. Given the above and the required mitigation measures to improve air quality/minimise impacts remaining unclear at this stage the current assessment would be a moderate adverse effect.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	This strategy proposes a higher level of growth for Malmesbury than the other two strategies. There is no AQMA in Malmesbury and it is understood to be lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as of immediate air quality concern. Growth of this scale is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. Given that the mitigation measures and development distributions are unknown at this stage, a minor adverse effect is considered likely at this stage.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth for Malmesbury than the other two strategies. There is no AQMA in Malmesbury and it is understood to be lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as of immediate air quality concern. However, growth of this scale is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. Given that the mitigation measures and development distributions are unknown at this stage, a minor adverse effect is considered likely at this stage.	This strategy proposes a similar level of growth for Malmesbury to CH-B. There is no AQMA in Malmesbury and it is understood to be lower risk with regards to air quality and is not highlighted as of immediate air quality concern. However, growth of this scale is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. Given that the mitigation measures and development distributions are unknown at this stage, a minor adverse effect is considered likely at this stage
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	CH-A places a moderate level of growth at Melksham. Melksham has been highlighted as a potential AQMA declaration location due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide and growth of this scale is	CH-B places a much lower level of growth at Melksham to CH-A. However, Melksham has been highlighted as a potential AQMA declaration location due to elevated levels of Nitrogen	CH-C places a significantly higher level of growth at Melksham. Melksham has been highlighted as a potential AQMA declaration location due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide and growth of this scale is

	likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. This level of growth is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective. Mitigation measures would need to be established to avoid increasing the likelihood of declaring an AQMA.	Dioxide and growth of this scale is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. This level of growth is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective. Mitigation measures would need to be established to avoid increasing the likelihood of declaring an AQMA.	likely to have some adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution. This level of growth is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective and effects are considerably more significant than the other two strategies. Mitigation measures would need to be established to avoid increasing the likelihood of declaring an AQMA.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	The level of development proposed in the rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away from many of the county's existing AQMAs and therefore is less likely to have significant adverse effects. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas of the rest of the HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of private car journeys which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. This scale of growth is likely to have some other adverse effects in terms of environmental pollution such as noise and light pollution from new development. This is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	There is a relatively low, but comparatively high level of growth proposed in Rest of HMA by this strategy. The level of development proposed in the rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away from many of the county's existing AQMA and therefore is less likely to have a moderate adverse impact upon any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas in rest of HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. This level of growth in these locations is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective. This strategy proposes the equivalent of CH-A and would therefore be likely to have a similar degree of effect on rural areas.	This strategy proposes a low level of growth in relative terms, but this is high in comparative terms. The level of development proposed in the Rest of the HMA is more likely to place development away from many of the county's existing AQMA and therefore is less likely to have a moderate adverse impact upon any existing AQMA. Due to the dispersed nature of facilities and the lack of public transport provision in certain areas in rest HMA, development may lead to a proportionately increased number of journeys in the private car which could lead to increased pollutants from vehicles. This level of growth in these locations is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective. This strategy proposes a higher level of growth and could therefore lead to more negative effects in rural areas than the roll forward option.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	-1.6 Overall, this development strategy is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects against this objective.
Conclusions/Recommendations:			
All strategies are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects overall against the SA objectives, given the scale of growth proposed, and there is no one more sustainable strategy . All three strategies score the same overall.			
Development at Calne and Devizes, where there are existing AQMAs, and at Chippenham and Melksham, which have been highlighted as potential AQMA declaration locations due to elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide, are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects where mitigation would be problematic			

All development strategies lead to significant additional development and are therefore likely to lead to increased air, noise and light pollution, particularly at Chippenham and Melksham which would receive significant growth levels through certain strategies

As the areas of poor air quality in Wiltshire are all traffic related, new development should contribute to improved air quality through reducing the need to travel by private car, promoting sustainable transport solutions and locating housing development in sustainable locations

With regards to other forms of environmental pollution, these are generally the result of urban development. Specific locational policies can ensure that development is directed to the most appropriate locations where air quality, noise and light pollution could be avoided or kept to a minimum

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Promote the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy?

For appraisal at subsequent, more detailed / site-specific SA stages

DAQ 2: Be located within flood zone 2? If so, are there alternative sites in the area that can be allocated in preference to developing land in flood zone 2? (To be determined through the application of the Sequential Test)

For appraisal at subsequent, more detailed / site-specific SA stages

DAQ 3: Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Fluvial flood-risk, along with surface and groundwater flood risk form part of the settlement-level analysis below. The cumulative impact of development was also considered in order to identify those catchments where an increase in flows as a result of growth would have the greatest impact on downstream flood risk. This analysis is based on a strategic assessment of flood risk. Local knowledge will be applied when specific development locations are identified. In terms of flood-risk potential at settlements the following can be stated:

Chippenham is at moderate risk of river, surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Melksham is at high risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Devizes is at low risk of river and surface water flooding and at high risk of groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as low.

Calne is at moderate risk of river and groundwater flooding and at high risk of surface water flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Corsham is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as moderate.

Malmesbury is at moderate risk of river flooding, at high risk of surface water flooding and at low risk of groundwater flooding. The cumulative impact of development is assessed as low.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
---------------------	------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Calne	Calne is at moderate risk of river and groundwater flooding and at high risk of surface water flooding. Calne has a moderately high level of development proposed under this scenario. Any new growth would need to take into account the surface water flooding experienced across the town. Moderate adverse effects are identified as a result.	Calne has a substantially reduced level of development proposed under this scenario, notably vis-à-vis Core Strategy Continued. Any new growth would need to take into account the surface water issues experienced across the town. Minor adverse effects are identified here as a result.	Calne has a moderately high level of development proposed under this scenario – similar to Core Strategy Continued. Any new growth would need to take into account the surface water issues experienced across the town. Moderate adverse effects are identified at the settlement as a result.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham has some areas of flood risk. Whilst the quantum directed at Chippenham under Core Strategy Continued is moderately high it is believed that proposed growth levels could be accommodated. Therefore, minor adverse effects are indicated.	Chippenham is at moderate risk of river, surface water and groundwater flooding. Levels of growth proposed under this strategy are significantly higher and therefore flood risk significantly greater, depending on the location of any new development. Cumulative impacts from various development locations is also higher. Moderate adverse effects likely overall.	Chippenham under this development scenario would receive a reduced quantum of growth, slightly less than but rather similar to Core Strategy Continued. Whilst all flood typologies demonstrate moderate risk levels, minor adverse effects are indicated for this settlement.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	Corsham is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Whilst all flood risk typologies are present, none is at high risk, rendering growth comparatively more feasible here under this objective, with minor adverse effects likely as a consequence.	Corsham has areas that are moderately susceptible to surface and groundwater flooding. Levels of development indicated at the town under this scenario, suggest minor adverse effects against this objective.	Alternative strategy CH-C proposes relatively high levels of development in Corsham, roughly commensurate with those under Core Strategy Continued, where greatest flood risk concerns are associated with ground and surface water. This level of development would lead to minor adverse effects on this objective at the town.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Core Strategy Continued proposes the greatest amount of development in Devizes of any strategy. The town has areas of groundwater flooding which development is recommended to avoid. Given that specific growth locations are as yet unknown, likely moderate adverse effects could accrue to the town.	Strategy CH-B proposes a moderately high level of development in Devizes, albeit less than in other scenarios, and substantially less than under Core Strategy Continued. Much of the settlement is at risk from groundwater flooding, and growth would need to avoid these areas. Given that specific sites for development are as yet unknown, moderate adverse effects are estimated at the town.	There is also a moderately large amount of development directed to Devizes, albeit fairly similar to those proposed under Core Strategy Continued. The town is at notable risk of groundwater flooding thus, since there are as yet no indications as regards site-specific development, likely moderate adverse effects are anticipated to accrue at this locality.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	In Malmesbury there are areas that are at risk of surface water flooding, moreover any development that does take place should carefully consider River Avon-related impacts.	Malmesbury meanwhile has numerous areas of land at risk especially of surface water flooding. Whilst proposed growth is less than half of that under Core Strategy Continued, given that	In Malmesbury, where proposed growth is similar to that under CH-B, there are large areas of land at risk of groundwater flooding. Minor adverse effects are thus suggested.

	Moderate adverse effects are therefore noted at this settlement as CH-A distributes a comparatively higher amount of development to Malmesbury.	specific development locations are as yet unknown, minor adverse effects are indicated.	
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is at high risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. With specific development locations not known this leads to moderate adverse effects likely at the town.	As regards Melksham there are vulnerabilities associated with the potential for especially fluvial flooding. Given the proposed lower growth quanta under scenario CH-B, minor adverse effects are considered likely for the town.	Melksham has its highest level of growth proposed under CH-C. The town possesses some areas of flood risk, mainly fluvial due to the course of the River Avon, but moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. As a result, moderate adverse effects are estimated here.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, are moderately high and therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which will be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, conserve the moderately high levels proposed under Core Strategy Continued, and are therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which will be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.	Development quanta for Rest of HMA, whilst not location-specific, are moderately high, and therefore estimated to lead to minor adverse effects, which will be clarified as site-level proposals emerge.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 Core Strategy Continued exhibits likely moderate adverse effects overall, with moderate adverse effects considered likely in Calne, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham.	-1.3 The overall judgement for this strategy is minor adverse effects. There are less settlements where significant adverse effects are likely – namely Chippenham and Devizes.	-1.4 Likely minor adverse effects are likely overall. There are less settlements where significant adverse effects are likely – namely Calne, Devizes and Melksham.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-B is considered to be the more sustainable strategy with significant adverse effects considered likely in two settlements - namely Chippenham and Devizes.

Strategy CH-A is considered to be the less sustainable strategy with significant adverse effects considered likely in four settlements - namely Calne, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham.

Whilst all areas across Chippenham HMA demonstrate some areas at risk of flooding, some places are more constrained than others. Alternative strategy CH-B, which focuses on Chippenham, offers the best opportunities to achieve flood-resilient development and mitigation.

Devizes is particularly constrained by groundwater flood-risk, which limits the areas of the settlement that might be suitable for further growth. This leads to an outcome of there being likely moderate adverse effects at the town under the more substantive growth scenarios (CH-A and CH-C). Under strategy CH-B growth here is more restrained and this contributes to making this scenario the most feasible for this HMA.

Calne, Melksham and Malmesbury also perform less strongly under this objective. This notwithstanding, these settlements tend to offer greater resilience under this objective via strategy CH-B, which directs reduced growth levels to these places.

In all instances, in order to provide climate change adaptation and mitigation and improve flood resilience, new development must incorporate green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment informs application of the sequential test and, if needed, the exception test.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6: Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Conserve and enhance World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks & Gardens, sites of archaeological interest, undesignated heritage assets and their settings?

Whilst this level of analysis makes some reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, these will be appraised in more detail, where necessary, at site-specific stage. Assets of note at this stage at/around the settlements include the following:

Chippenham: specific assets include the town conservation area, registered park at Corsham and garden at Sheldon, Rowden conservation area and archaeology west of the A350. Also, assets associated with the manorial landscapes to the south of the town and vernacular stone villages to the north.

Melksham: specific assets include the town conservation area, Spa and Woolmore Manor (and their settings) to the south-east of the town and Beanacre Manor to the north.

Devizes: specific assets include the Castle scheduled monument & town conservation area and their settings, Roundway Down Battlefield, Caen Hill Locks and the Kennet & Avon Canal.

Calne: specific assets include the town conservation area, registered parkland such as Bowood Park, the scheduled moated site at Pinhills Farm and medieval settlements at Beversbrook and Quemerford.

Corsham: specific assets include the town conservation area, relict former estate parkland to the north and east including the registered park and garden at Corsham Court. Also surrounding conservation areas at Pickwick, Neston, Easton and Gastard.

Malmesbury: specific assets include the Abbey, St Paul's bell tower spire and the town conservation area and their settings.

DAQ 2: Maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements through high quality and appropriate design, taking into account the management objectives of Conservation Areas?

Whilst this level of analysis makes some reference to historic landscape character and townscape quality, design and conservation areas will feature more strongly in subsequent, more detailed / site-specific, appraisal.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	In and around Calne, accommodating growth, including a moderate quantum of land for employment growth, is moderately challenging. In	Under this scenario proposed growth at Calne is much lower compared to Core Strategy Continued. Calne is comparatively less	Under this scenario proposed growth at Calne is much lower compared to Core Strategy Continued. Calne is comparatively less constrained under this objective than

	addition to heritage highlighted above, there are the designated assets associated with the agrarian economy, River Marden and canal and railway. Given that development locations are unknown moderate adverse effects are therefore likely.	constrained under this objective than other settlements in the HMA; minor adverse effects are thus likely. Specificity of sites will allow informed assessment.	other settlements in the HMA; minor adverse effects are thus likely. Specificity of sites will allow informed assessment.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	At and around Chippenham accommodating growth is moderately challenging. Assets particularly at-risk include registered parkland, conservation areas and archaeology. Given that development locations are unclear minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	Compared to CH-A, CH-B significantly increases the amount of growth directed to Chippenham and includes a moderate quantum of land for employment growth, which makes accommodating expansion at this settlement comparatively more challenging. This could place at-risk designated & non-designated heritage assets and their settings, which in particular include registered parkland, conservation areas and archaeology. In addition, large-scale urban expansion north of the town could affect the individual character of the surrounding cluster of high-quality rural settlements. Given proposed quanta in/around Chippenham, inclusive of a moderate quantum for business growth, it is estimated that moderate adverse effects are likely. Careful selection of sites could however mean that subsequent assessment of impacts suggests greater sustainability.	In and around Chippenham accommodating proposed growth would be moderately challenging, albeit at rates similar to CH-A. Assets particularly at-risk include registered parkland, conservation areas and archaeology. Minor adverse effects are likely here.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	Growth levels would be challenging for heritage in and around Corsham. In addition to the heritage highlighted above, of additional note here and requiring protection would be relict parkland. Given the above, the growth quantum directed towards Corsham through CH-A is likely to have moderate adverse effects.	Whilst proposed development levels would be challenging to accommodate at Corsham it is believed that, under this scenario, a comparative reduction of quanta compared to CH-A may lead to less adverse effects. However, moderate adverse effects are still likely at this stage of assessment.	Such growth levels, including a moderate quantum of land for employment growth, would also be challenging for heritage in and around Corsham. On the basis of the above, moderate adverse effects are therefore likely due to heritage assets and their settings in and around Corsham.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	Growth levels would be challenging for heritage in and around Devizes. Given the heritage assets in and around Devizes, CH-A is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	Under this strategy, a comparative reduction of quanta compared to CH-A means that growth may be more sustainable, suggesting likely minor adverse effects at this stage of assessment.	Under this strategy, a comparative reduction of quanta compared to CH-A means that growth may be more sustainable, suggesting likely minor adverse effects at this stage of assessment
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse

Malmesbury	It is estimated that proposed growth levels under CH-A would be challenging for heritage in and around Malmesbury. In addition to the heritage highlighted above, of additional note here, and requiring protection, are distinctive historic landscape character that includes parkland/estates and water-meadows. This strategy is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects against this objective.	Under this strategy, a comparative reduction of quanta compared to CH-A suggests that growth may be more sustainable, and likely minor adverse effects at this stage of assessment.	Under this strategy, a comparative reduction of quanta compared to CH-A suggests that growth may be more sustainable, and likely minor adverse effects at this stage of assessment.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Whilst it may be feasible to accommodate proposed growth in/around Melksham, at a strategic stage minor adverse effects on heritage assets are considered likely.	Under this scenario proposed growth at Melksham is significantly lower than CH-A. Melksham is less constrained than all other settlements in this HMA and minor adverse effects are considered likely under this strategy. Specificity of sites will allow informed assessment.	CH-C, including a moderate quantum of land for employment growth, would substantially increase growth in and around Melksham, substantially higher than under CH-A. This could place risks upon designated & non-designated heritage assets and their settings in/around this locality. Moderate adverse effects on heritage assets are likely, however, Melksham is relatively unconstrained in heritage terms and depending on the location of any new development, mitigation is easily achievable.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Under this strategy development rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The nature of heritage assets distribution in the rural area means that such growth locations would have to be selected carefully. Overall, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.	Under this strategy development rates in Rest of HMA are the same as CH-A. The nature of heritage assets distribution in the rural area means that such growth locations would have to be selected carefully. Overall, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.	Development rates in Rest of HMA under this strategy are higher than CH-A and CH-B. However, given the size of the rural area and therefore the ability for development to avoid harm to heritage assets, minor adverse effects are likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.6 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have moderate adverse effects overall on this objective.	-1.3 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have minor adverse effects overall on this objective.	-1.3 On balance, considering all settlements/areas in this HMA, it is considered that this strategy is likely to have minor adverse effects overall on this objective.
Conclusions/Recommendations:			
In terms of likelihood of significant effects on heritage assets, strategies CH-B and CH-C score equally and are considered the more sustainable options.			
Strategy CH-A is considered the less sustainable option and will result in the most settlements with significant adverse effects.			

Recommendation - a key recommendation of this SA is to explore an additional development strategy that would reduce prospective development levels in/around the more constrained settlements of Malmesbury, Corsham and Devizes. Such a strategy could increase the growth at Melksham, Calne and Chippenham which are relatively unconstrained in heritage terms but also in environmental terms more generally.

In this HMA, significant levels of growth in Malmesbury, Corsham and Devizes, proposed under strategy CH-A, is considered the least preferable. These settlements are more constrained in terms of heritage assets and mitigation measures would be harder to implement.

Strategy CH-B does direct substantial growth to Chippenham indicating moderate adverse effects on heritage assets in/around that locality. It is possible that mitigation would, at site-specific level, be able to reduce and mitigate these significant adverse effects through careful site selection and sensitive site design and layout.

Under strategy CH-C, the greatest comparative growth is directed towards Melksham, which represents a sustainable option as Melksham is relatively unconstrained in heritage terms. However, the same strategy proposes marginally higher levels of growth than under CH-B for Malmesbury, Corsham and Devizes, which will increase the likelihood of significant adverse effects.

Overall, Chippenham, Melksham, Calne and the Rest of the HMA offer the greatest scope for accommodating higher levels of development proposed under this objective.

The SA findings suggest that the levels of growth proposed would not lead to any 'major' adverse effects at any of the settlements which would mean that mitigation measures are not achievable

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7: Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance nationally designated landscapes and their settings and locally valued landscapes?

Whilst this strategic-level analysis appraises designated and locally-valued assets, local ones will become even more prominent during detailed / site-specific SA. Principal assets of note at the settlements are as follows.

Chippenham: The area has Spye Parklands Special Landscape Area, along with three registered parks and gardens (Spye, Bowood House and Corsham Park) that in particular would need to be taken into consideration. Cotswolds AONB lies approx. 3km to the west of Chippenham.

Melksham: the principal asset is Spye & Bowood Parklands Special Landscape Area, to the north-east.

Devizes: specific assets include the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Calne: North Wessex Downs AONB and Bowood registered park and garden are both in the wider vicinity.

Corsham: most notably Green Belt to the west of Rudloe, Cotswolds AONB and special landscape area, Corsham Park and other locally-valued land.

Malmesbury: most notably The Abbey, the surrounding landscape context and, westwards, also the setting of Brokenborough and Cotswolds AONB.

DAQ 2: Protect rights of way, public open space and common land?

These features will be assessed in greater detail in successive rounds of sustainability appraisal when the analysis becomes more detailed.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Through this development strategy, adverse effects are likely in the Calne area, where proposed levels of development, including a moderate quantum of employment, would likely have minor adverse effects. The North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west. There are no local landscape designations.	This development strategy has growth levels which are considerably reduced compared to CH-A. There are no local landscape designations. The North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.	This development strategy has growth levels similar to CH-B. There are no local landscape designations. The North Wessex Downs AONB lies approx. 2km to the east of Calne and Bowood Registered Park and Garden is to the west. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Through this development strategy relatively less harm is likely to accrue to the Chippenham area, where proposed levels of development would be moderately challenging to accommodate. Minor adverse effects are indicated.	A significant increase in growth through this strategy, including a moderate quantum of land for business growth, suggests increased impacts on landscape assets and, as such, development would need to be planned carefully. In addition to landscape assets highlighted above, large-scale urban expansion to the north would need to maintain individual character at, and between, the cluster of high-quality rural settlements in that locality. Such an increase in proposed growth indicates moderate adverse effects are likely around Chippenham with mitigation problematic.	Through this development strategy – similar to levels for CH-A, relatively less impacts are likely on landscape assets. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely at this stage.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	Corsham is more constrained in landscape terms by the proximity of the Green Belt, Cotswold AONB, locally-valued landscapes and registered parkland. This strategy proposes the highest level of growth at Corsham and moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Corsham is more constrained in landscape terms by the proximity of the Green Belt, Cotswold AONB, locally-valued landscapes and registered parkland. This strategy proposes a lower level of growth at Corsham than CH-A but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely in this location.	Corsham is more constrained in landscape terms by the proximity of the Green Belt, Cotswold AONB, locally-valued landscapes and registered parkland. This strategy proposes a similar level of growth at Corsham to CH-B and therefore moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	The North Wessex Downs AONB lies close to the north and east of Devizes but the town itself is not in the AONB and there are significant parts of the town which are not constrained by landscape designations. The level of growth proposed in CH-A is significantly higher than the other two strategies	The North Wessex Downs AONB lies close to the north and east of Devizes but the town itself is not in the AONB and there are significant parts of the town which are not constrained by landscape designations.	The North Wessex Downs AONB lies close to the north and east of Devizes but the town itself is not in the AONB and there are significant parts of the town which are not constrained by landscape designations. The level of growth proposed in CH-C is similar to that in CH-B and likely effects are therefore also considered to be minor adverse.

	and therefore moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	The level of growth proposed in CH-B is significantly less than CH-A and likely effects are therefore considered to be minor adverse.	
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	The proposed levels of development in and around Malmesbury could lead to significant impacts upon landscape assets. The setting of Malmesbury is especially dominated by its hilltop Abbey. In addition, the historic town core needs to retain strong connections with countryside along river valleys from outlying countryside. Cotswolds AONB lies adjacent to the existing urban edge of the town to the west and south. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.	CH-B proposes significantly less growth than CH-A. The setting of Malmesbury is especially dominated by its hilltop Abbey. In addition, the historic town core needs to retain strong connections with countryside along river valleys from outlying countryside. Cotswolds AONB lies adjacent to the existing urban edge of the town to the west and south. Given this reduced quantum of growth, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.	CH-C proposes a similar level of growth to CH-B. The setting of Malmesbury is especially dominated by its hilltop Abbey. In addition, the historic town core needs to retain strong connections with countryside along river valleys from outlying countryside. Cotswolds AONB lies adjacent to the existing urban edge of the town to the west and south. Given this reduced quantum of growth compared with CH-A, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Melksham is the least constrained settlement in landscape terms. However, location of development sites is not known. This level of growth should be able to be accommodated in landscape terms without resulting in significant effects. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.	Melksham is the least constrained settlement in landscape terms. However, location of development sites is not known. This level of growth should be able to be accommodated in landscape terms without resulting in significant effects. Minor adverse effects are considered likely.	Under development strategy CH-C Melksham would receive significantly increased growth compared to CH-A and CH-B. However, the town is nevertheless deemed to be the least constrained settlement in this HMA in landscape terms. Development should avoid encroaching on the rising ground to the east along A3102 as this will impact on Bowood and Spye Park SLA, and be highly visible within the surrounding landscape. Growth should also seek to conserve and enhance the river corridor landscapes. Given that growth locations are however unclear minor adverse effects are deemed likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are elevated. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.	Under this strategy growth rates in Rest of HMA are higher than CH-A and CH-B. The presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would have to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are therefore considered most likely until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise locations.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse

Overall HMA score	-1.6 Moderate adverse effects are considered likely for the strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	-1.4 Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	-1.2 Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.
--------------------------	--	--	--

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas, strategy **CH-C is considered to be the more sustainable option** as there are less adverse effects.

Strategy CH-A is considered to be the less sustainable option as it is the only strategy likely to have significant adverse effects overall.

Recommendation: A key recommendation would be to generate an additional development strategy that would direct lower levels of development to Corsham and Malmesbury which are the most constrained in landscape terms, and direct a proportionately higher level of growth towards the less constrained settlements of Calne, Chippenham and Melksham. Such a strategy would direct growth to Chippenham at rates midway between current strategies CH-B and CH-A/CH-C, with potentially higher levels of growth potential at Melksham and Calne.

The most constrained settlement in landscape terms is Corsham which has Green Belt to the west of Rudloe, the Cotswolds AONB in close proximity to the north and west, a special landscape area, Corsham Park and other locally-valued land. Mitigation would include reducing the quantum of development being directed to Corsham.

Less constrained settlements are Calne, Chippenham, Devizes and Melksham which may be able to accommodate larger quanta of growth in landscape terms. In particular, Melksham has very few landscape constraints and is considered to be able to accommodate a higher level of growth than all other settlements except Chippenham

In the Rest of the HMA, the presence of large national designations (AONB), Green Belt in the western part of the area as well as locally-valued landscapes mean that locations in Rest of HMA would need to be selected very carefully with adequate mitigation to reduce landscape effects. Moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for all Rest of the HMA options until a more detailed assessment can be undertaken of more precise development locations.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 8: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing?

Delivery of homes in **Calne** has been above planned rates. The ratio of house price to earnings has increased to 8.07 but remains lower than the average for Wiltshire. 31% of housing delivered at Calne during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 was affordable, against a minimum target of 30%

At **Chippenham** the ratio of house price to earnings has also risen slightly but remains below the Wiltshire average. This is in spite of only 18% of all housing delivered in the area from 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 being affordable. Historic delivery of homes at the town has been well below planned levels due to delays in bringing forward sites allocated in the plan.

Housing at **Corsham** has been delivered at planned rates but only 20% of these were affordable housing. The house price to earnings ratio has risen to 11.25 which is above the average for Wiltshire. Proximity to AONB and the Green Belt to the west may be a contributing factor here.

At 8.94 the ratio of house price to earnings for **Devizes** is below the Wiltshire average. Housing completions have historically been higher than planned, resulting in affordable housing delivery at 35.5% which is above the minimum target of 30%.

The ratio of house price to earnings in **Malmesbury** continues to be one of the highest in Wiltshire at 14.13. Recent housing building has been slightly higher than planned but only 23% have been affordable against a target of 40%

Housing delivery has been above planned rates at **Melksham**, 34% of which has been affordable housing, above the minimum requirement for the area. The ratio of house price to earnings for the town is 8.3 which is below the Wiltshire average but higher than in 2008 following the trend seen nationally.

For the **Rest of the HMA** (the rural area) homes have been delivered at or above expected levels. Affordability ratios are, however, higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years, relative to higher tier settlements.

The updated housing requirement means that growth for the HMA will be higher (by approximately 7,000 homes) than the number of homes allocated for 2006 – 2026 under the WCS. Approximately 49% of this proposed housing requirement for the Chippenham HMA is already committed. However, the provision of a significant number of additional new homes could potentially make a notable contribution to the provision of affordable homes in the HMA.

SA conclusions relate to the ability of the strategy to deliver affordable homes where they are needed and where house price to income ratios are highest.

DAQ 2: Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community?

Developments providing a mix of house types and sizes can be delivered on small or large sites. For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 3: Deliver high quality residential development?

High quality developments providing a mix of tenures can be delivered on small or large sites. For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options in relation to the quality of housing or mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	Existing commitments would deliver just over half of the housing requirement for Calne leaving a further 860 dwellings to be identified. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne.	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Calne leaving an additional 250 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. Whilst this effectively rolls forward the WCS level of growth existing commitments would be built out within the next 10 years, meaning that there would be a low level of homes being delivered in the latter half of the plan period. For this reason, it is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a neutral effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne,	Existing commitments would deliver just over half of the housing requirement for the town leaving a further 420 dwellings to be identified. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Calne.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: neutral	Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	Historic delivery at Chippenham has been slow. However, rolling forward the pro-rata requirement	Under Strategy B Chippenham would be expected to deliver just under 10,000 dwellings from 2016-	Under Strategy C Chippenham would be expected to deliver approximately 6,930 dwellings from 2016-2036,

	under CH-A for the town means that Chippenham would be expected to deliver 6,441 dwellings from 2016-2036. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 1,830 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.	2036. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 5,155 dwellings. This is a substantial number of homes to be built during the plan period and would no doubt ensure a large number of affordable units, although this would depend on the demand matching what is being provided, and this not resulting in a shortfall in provision in other parts of the HMA where demand for affordable homes may be high. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a major positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.	significantly more than in the current WCS and marginally higher than Strategy CH-A. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 2320 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Chippenham.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
Corsham	For Corsham, rolling forward the current strategy would mean an increase in housing provision to 1740 dwellings compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 1,265. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.	Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Corsham as for the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 745, or just over half. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.	Under Strategy C there would be an increase in housing provision of 500 at Corsham compared to the previous plan period, slightly less than Strategy A. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 890. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Corsham.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	Rolling forward the current WCS strategy at Devizes, would mean a significant increase of 900 dwellings to the housing requirement for the town. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 2,025 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.	Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Devizes as for the previous plan period. Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 1,165 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.	Under Strategy C, there would be an increase of 800 dwellings to the housing requirement for Devizes, marginally higher than Strategy CH-B. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 1405 homes. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would also be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Devizes.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	Rolling forward the WCS against the housing requirements for Malmesbury for 2016-2036 would mean an increase of 400 dwellings for the plan period compared to current housing requirements. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 715 dwellings. Given the high affordability ratio and relatively low growth	Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Malmesbury compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account commitments there would be a residual requirement of 340 dwellings. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be	Under Strategy C the housing requirements for Malmesbury 2016-2036 would mean an increase of approximately 300 dwellings for the plan period compared to current housing requirements, marginally lower than Strategy A and marginally higher than Strategy B. Taking into account commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 445 dwellings. It is

	proposed, it is uncertain whether the scale of growth under this strategy would be sufficient to address the current imbalance. However, CH-A allocates the highest number of homes to the town, compared to the alternatives, and is therefore considered likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.	likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.	considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Malmesbury.
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	At Melksham, rolling forward the WCS strategy against the housing requirements for 2016-2036 would mean an increase in 1,000 homes to be delivered at the town compared to housing requirements for the current plan period. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,850 homes for the town. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.	Under Strategy B the same housing requirement would be applied to Melksham compared to the previous plan period. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 890 homes for the town. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.	Under Strategy C the housing requirements for 2016-2036 would mean a significant increase in approximately 1,750 homes to be delivered at Melksham compared to housing requirements for the current plan period. This is significantly higher than Strategy A. Taking into account existing commitments, there is a residual requirement of 2600 homes for the town. It is, however, uncertain whether the increase in provision would result in an over-supply of affordable homes at the town. However, it is considered that this scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a major positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Melksham.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive
Rest of HMA	A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in these parts of the Rest of the HMA. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,470 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	Under Strategy B the housing requirements for 2016 – 2036 would mean an increase in housing requirement of approximately 900 dwellings to be met at small and large villages. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,470 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	Under Strategy C there would be a modest increase in housing requirement compared with strategies A and B to be met at small and large villages. Taking into account existing commitments there is a residual requirement of 1,930 homes for the Rest of the HMA. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance is likely to result in a minor positive effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor positive

Overall HMA score	1.3 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	0.9 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.	1.4 Minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy overall, based on the assessment of all settlements/areas.
--------------------------	--	--	--

Conclusions/Recommendations:

All three strategies score positively against this objective, but this is assuming that the level of housing proposed is achieved. However, it is important to consider which option would be most likely to result in the most sustainable distribution of affordable homes. Based on this assessment, **Strategy CH-C is considered to have the greatest sustainability benefits and is the more sustainable option.** Strategy CH-A is considered to be only slightly less sustainable than CH-C.

Strategy CH-B is considered to be the less sustainable option as, although likely to be positive overall, benefits will be less than the other two strategies.

The number of homes for Wiltshire proposed for the purpose of this assessment is greater than the latest OAN (determined by the national standard methodology) by more than 5,000 homes. The proportion of affordable homes needed has been determined on this basis to be 37%. This is consistent for each of the scenarios under consideration.

The housing need for the Chippenham HMA is notably higher than for the previous plan period and therefore the level provision of homes under each of the strategies is more likely to have a positive effect for the overall provision of affordable homes at most of the settlements.

Strategy CH-A distribution would result in the highest number of significant benefits in a greater number of settlements. However, CH-C would result in greater sustainability benefits overall, given the significant amount attributed to Melksham, significant benefits also at Chippenham and that benefits are also likely in the Rest of the HMA. At Melksham, under Strategy CH-C, there is a risk of over-provision of affordable homes at the town but overall, this strategy performs better than CH-A and CH-B.

Strategy CH-B would have major positive effects at Chippenham but at the expense of adequate affordable homes provision in all of the other settlements/areas. This leads to some uncertainty as to whether this would result in the delivery of affordable homes when and where they are needed. If actual delivery of homes at Chippenham is unable to reach target rates, for example, there is no guarantee that this would be made up elsewhere within the HMA at sustainable locations.

A better understanding of the likely delivery timescales for development at Chippenham and Melksham will be needed to determine whether the proposed levels of homes for these settlements under scenarios CH-B and CH-C are realistic and achievable within the plan period.

A rural facilities survey should be undertaken to identify where the provision of homes could be targeted to help support the vitality of rural settlements in the HMA.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 9: Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive communities with better services and facilities.

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Maximise opportunities within the most deprived areas?

Within the Chippenham HMA there are areas of deprivation identified in Melksham, Chippenham and Calne. Older people are at risk of social isolation in Calne and Melksham.

Calne is currently a location where deprivation is apparent, with 6% of residents living in areas of high deprivation. Additionally, a number of children living in low income families, the number of younger people being supported by social care and a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) are higher than the Wiltshire average.

Deprivation is apparent in **Chippenham** with 6% of the population living in areas of high deprivation.

Deprivation is apparent in **Melksham** with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. Additionally, a higher than Wiltshire average proportion of young people are living in low income families and/or are being supported by social care.

A higher than the Wiltshire average proportion of younger people live within low income families and are supported by CAF in **Devizes**.

DAQ 2: Be accessible to educational, health, amenity greenspace, community and town centre facilities which are able to cope with the additional demand?

Secondary schools in **Chippenham** are expected to reach their capacity in upcoming years and there is an opportunity to expand the Abbeyfield School. However, the school is being expanded to meet known demand and expansion is subject to PFI barriers. A substantial number of homes on a single site is likely to require the provision of a new secondary school and higher levels of growth, such as an additional 4500 homes would therefore enable a new school. Further, primary provision is also expected to be required, while emerging strategic sites are likely to bring forward additional primary provision. Chippenham has a community hospital and currently has excess GP capacity when overall capacity is considered. However, it is expected to have a GP capacity gap (-27m²) by 2026 so would require further investment in the future.

Despite a hospital being situated in **Melksham**, there is an existing GP capacity issue (-112m²), which is expected to increase by 2026 (-154m²). There is limited capacity available at Melksham Oak School, with it being expected that the school provision has been secured reaches capacity in the near future. Additionally, expansion is planned for the school to meet known emerging demand. Further expansion risks creating a very large school. More substantial levels of housing, in the region of 4500 homes would be able to support new secondary school provision. New primary and expansion is being pursued currently, but beyond this additional primary provision would have to be delivered, with around 1300 homes being able to support a new primary school.

A community hospital is situated at **Devizes** and additionally there are plans to refurbish Lansdowne GP surgery. Despite this, Devizes has the second largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG as of September 2016 (-612m²). This is predicted to increase to -820m² by 2026. There is capacity within the Devizes Secondary School to take on new students from modest levels of housing development. Some investment opportunities could be apparent at Devizes School and Lavington School. The latter of which is at capacity. There is a surplus of places among primary schools in the area and opportunities for expansion are apparent.

The NHS have identified an opportunity to support a GP surgery redevelopment in **Malmesbury**, where there are no existing GP capacity gaps identified or forecast for the future. Malmesbury Secondary School is currently undergoing expansion to meet known demand from new development and there may be limited opportunities to expand the school beyond this. Substantial additional growth could support new secondary school provision. Opportunities to expand the PFI school could be subject to complex negotiations. Expansion of the primary school is currently taking place and there are additional opportunities for new or expanded provision.

Corsham is in the top 10 for largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG (-283m²) in September 2016. The gap is expected to increase to -408m² by 2026. There is scope to expand the existing secondary school, but current plans being pursued to provide places for known demand from new housing. Additional expansion (upwards of 1000 homes) risks creating an extremely large school. Therefore, larger numbers of housing would require new provision. Recent expansion of Corsham Primary School has been apparent to meet known demand, although there is a small existing surplus of places. As a result, additional primary provision is expected to be required.

Calne has a community hospital and currently has excess GP capacity when overall capacity is considered. However, it is expected to have a GP capacity gap by 2026 (-79m²) so would require further investment in the future. There is capacity at John Bentley Secondary School and a further opportunity for expansion. An additional secondary school could be supported during the plan period by substantial levels of housing at Calne, but the needs of an additional 1400 homes could be accommodated by expanding the existing school. Additional primary provision is expected to be required, while Priestly Primary school has recently been expanded to meet known demand, further expansion on of this primary school is an opportunity.

DAQ 3: Promote/create public spaces and community facilities that might support public health, civic, cultural, recreational and community functions?

For this high-level stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options in relation to public spaces and community facilities. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of housing and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 4: Reduce rural isolation, including access to affordable services for those without a car in rural areas?			
Rural areas suffer from lack of access to services and facilities, so additional development in these areas without promoting services alongside could lead to more isolation. However, affordability is an issue in the rest of the HMA. Therefore, development in these areas could potentially address this issue. In addition, rural development is likely to have good access to green/open space.			
Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	<p>This strategy proposes the highest level of growth in Calne, which may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. New development is likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. This proposed level of growth in Calne is considered likely to have moderate positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Comparatively this strategy directs less development to Calne than the other strategies. Additionally, the level of growth is relatively and proportionately low and lower than rolling forward the current strategy. Despite uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation and a small health service capacity issue, this strategy provides opportunities to invest in these in an area where education services are likely to be able to cope with additional demand resulting from this level of growth. As a result, it is likely that there would be minor positive effects when compared to the roll forward.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes similar levels of growth to CH-B and is therefore expected to lead to similar effects. Likely areas of development are not known at this stage. There are opportunities to invest in areas of deprivation, school provision and health services and therefore, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on this objective.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	<p>At Chippenham, this strategy proposes a low level of proportionate growth. This is moderate in relative and comparative terms, however. This strategy will have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. It will create opportunities for investment in an area with apparent issues of deprivation and in health services. But this level of growth is unlikely to support new school provision at Chippenham and is therefore likely to have a minor positive effect only.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes significantly higher levels of growth for Chippenham and a higher level of growth than rolling forward the Core Strategy which may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities. However, this strategy is likely to support investment into areas suffering from deprivation and into health services. Additionally, this significant level of growth should be able to support new secondary level schooling provision which will reach capacity in forthcoming years. Significant new development is likely to be much more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. As a result of significant growth under this strategy, it is likely that major positive effects will result. When compared to the roll forward it is likely that there would be more opportunities to</p>	<p>This strategy proposes moderate levels of growth at Chippenham, in proportionate, relative and comparative terms. This strategy creates opportunities for investment in an area where deprivation is apparent and in health services. But it is unclear whether this level of growth would be able to support new primary and secondary schooling provision at Chippenham and it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect. This strategy proposes similar levels of growth when compared to Strategy CH-A and is therefore expected to lead to similar effects.</p>

		mitigate impacts on this objective through higher levels of growth.	
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Corsham	<p>This strategy proposes the highest level of growth in Corsham, which may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. New development is likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>This proposed level of growth in Corsham is considered likely to have moderate positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Within Corsham, this level of growth is proportionately and relatively low - lower levels are proposed through this strategy than through the roll forward. However, it should still have some benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/ recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>Due to the substantial GP gap identified and unclear opportunities to invest in both health services and school through this strategy, it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect only. It is unclear whether this strategy would be sufficient to lead to mitigation when compared to the roll forward of the current strategy.</p>	<p>This level of growth is similar to CH-B and relatively low compared to roll forward CH-A. However, it should still have some benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/ recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>Due to the substantial GP gap identified and unclear opportunities to invest in both health services and school through this strategy, it is therefore likely that there would be a minor positive effect only. It is unclear whether this strategy would be sufficient to lead to mitigation when compared to the roll forward of the current strategy.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	<p>CH-A focusses a proportionately high level of growth in Devizes which may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>Devizes has the second largest gap in GP provision in the Wiltshire CCG as of September 2016 (- 612m²) and this is predicted to increase to -820m² by 2026.</p> <p>Due to opportunities to invest in health services, areas suffering from deprivation and existing school places, it is likely that this proportionately high level of growth will have moderate positive effects.</p>	<p>This level of growth is low in relative terms and lower when compared directly to the roll forward. Existing school provision could be able to support this level of growth, additionally this strategy could direct investment into areas subject to deprivation and local health services.</p> <p>New development is likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>Therefore, it is likely that this level of growth will have minor positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Due to the surplus places at schools in the area and opportunities at Devizes to invest in areas suffering from deprivation and health services, it is likely that there would be a minor positive effect on this objective as a result of this strategy. This strategy proposes similar levels of growth when compared to Strategy CH-B and is therefore expected to lead to a similar effect.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive

Malmesbury	<p>This strategy proposes proportionately moderate, but comparatively high levels of growth at Malmesbury. There are no existing GP capacity gaps identified or forecast for the future. Substantial additional growth could support new secondary school provision.</p> <p>This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. New development is likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>This proposed level of growth in Malmesbury is considered likely to have moderate positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Comparatively this strategy directs less development to Malmesbury than the other strategies. Additionally, the level of growth is relatively and proportionately low and lower than rolling forward the current strategy. Despite some uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation, this strategy is more likely to be positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>As a result, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes similar levels of growth to CH-B and is therefore expected to lead to similar effects. Despite some uncertainties relating to the capabilities of this strategy in overcoming issues of deprivation, this strategy is more likely to be positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>As a result, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	<p>Deprivation is relatively high with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. There is an existing GP capacity issue and limited capacity at Melksham Oak School.</p> <p>CH-A places a moderate level of growth proportionately and relatively within Melksham. A high level of growth is proposed when compared to other strategies.</p> <p>There is the opportunity to invest in health services and areas suffering from deprivation and benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>CH-A is considered likely to have moderate positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Deprivation is relatively high with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. There is an existing GP capacity issue and limited capacity at Melksham Oak School.</p> <p>CH-B proposes lower growth proportionately and relatively within Melksham.</p> <p>There is the opportunity to invest in health services and areas suffering from deprivation and benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing, new or expanded community/ cultural/recreational facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>CH-B is considered likely to have minor positive effects against this objective.</p>	<p>Deprivation is relatively high with 10% of the population living in areas of high deprivation. There is an existing GP capacity issue and limited capacity at Melksham Oak School.</p> <p>CH-B proposes significantly higher growth at Melksham. High levels of growth are considered to be capable of overcoming existing issues and provide investment opportunities into areas of deprivation, health services and primary and secondary education.</p> <p>Significant new development is likely to be far more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. This proposed significant level of growth in Melksham is considered likely to have major positive effects against this objective.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive

Rest of HMA	<p>This strategy proposes relatively low levels of growth in the rural parts of the HMA. Services and facilities such as shops and public transport services have reduced in recent years with higher levels of deprivation and social exclusion on accessibility grounds. Development on a smaller scale in large and small villages is likely to be positive in terms of providing some affordable housing and will help improve viability of local services and facilities. The level of growth in CH-A is considered likely to have minor positive effects overall.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes the same levels of growth in the rural parts of the HMA as CH-A. Services and facilities such as shops and public transport services have reduced in recent years with higher levels of deprivation and social exclusion on accessibility grounds. Development on a smaller scale in large and small villages is likely to be positive in terms of providing some affordable housing and will help improve viability of local services and facilities. The level of growth in CH-B is considered likely to have minor positive effects overall.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes higher levels of growth in the rural parts of the HMA. Development on a smaller scale in large and small villages is likely to be positive in terms of providing some affordable housing and will help improve viability of local services and facilities. The level of growth in CH-C is considered likely to have greater benefits overall than the other two strategies but still minor positive.</p>
Overall HMA score	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p> <p>1.7 Overall, this strategy is likely to have moderate positive effects on objective 9 as higher levels of growth are distributed more evenly among a greater number of settlements.</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p> <p>1.3 Overall, it is likely that there would be minor positive effects on this objective. Significant benefits are mainly likely at Chippenham but due to the uneven distribution, other settlements/areas are only likely to receive minor benefits in improving levels of deprivation, social exclusion and community facilities and services.</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p> <p>1.3 Overall, it is likely that there would be minor positive effects on this objective. Significant benefits are mainly likely at Melksham but due to the uneven distribution, other settlements/areas are only likely to receive minor benefits in improving levels of deprivation, social exclusion and community facilities and services.</p>

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Strategy CH-A is considered likely to be the more sustainable option for this objective as there are higher levels of growth distributed more evenly among different settlements which results in significant benefits likely to occur in a larger number of settlements.

Strategies CH-B and CH-C score equally and are considered the less sustainable options. They tend to result in likely significant benefits in just the one location in each case – Chippenham in CH-B and Melksham in CH-C. This decreases the benefits in all of the other locations in the HMA.

New development can place additional pressures on existing services and facilities in all settlements. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing for those on low incomes or currently living in inappropriate housing, new or expanded community/cultural/recreational facilities, including new schools and healthcare facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.

New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.

There are opportunities within all strategies to support and improve the health and wellbeing of communities. All settlements within the Chippenham HMA, besides Malmesbury, are subject to an either existing or emerging GP gap. Additional development risks exacerbating this issue, but could result in investment in services and facilities where existing issues are apparent. This investment is somewhat necessary in Melksham, Corsham and Devizes, where GP capacity issues are forecast to get worse even without any additional investment or new development.

There are existing issues of deprivation identified in Devizes, Chippenham, Melksham and Calne. Each strategy proposes growth of some level in these settlements, therefore creating opportunities for investment and provision of affordable housing where deprivation is apparent.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Promote mixed use developments, in accessible locations, that reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car?

Limited notable observations are possible at this stage in relation to this DAQ. Further consideration will be given to these matters at a later, more site specific, stage where more precise accessibility, development mix and travel options become clearer. Where observations can be made at this strategic stage, they have been made below.

Each of the main settlements within this HMA possess bus travel options to varying degrees to offer alternatives to private car travel. Rail links within settlements are not universal and are only present within Chippenham and Melksham. When looking at the rest of the HMA, many of these locations are positioned in less accessible locations than the market towns and principal settlements and may increase the reliance on the private car, often being positioned further away from many amenities or public transport services.

DAQ 2: Provide suitable access and not significantly exacerbate issues of local transport capacity (unless there is evidence that such impacts can be mitigated)?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of certain key strategic constraints at each location. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise suitability of access along with the impacts on local transport capacity. More detailed assessment will be possible at the site assessment stage where impacts along with mitigation/improvement measures will become clearer.

Calne suffers from highway network congestion, notably around Wood Street and Curzon Street, which also has an impact on the AQMA designation. This highway congestion has an impact on any services or transportation using the A4 through the town.

Hosting highway links with the A350, A4 and A420, **Chippenham** sits at the centre of a number of key highway routes that, particularly at peak hours, suffer from congestion impacting journey times. The A350 around Chippenham carries the highest volume of vehicles and HGVs on Wiltshire Primary Route Network. These key routes, particularly where they pass through the town, are constrained by pinch points caused by bridges and historic layouts.

Corsham's main highway link lies with the A4 that sits on the northern edge of the town. Congestion has been particularly highlighted at junctions on this route, having subsequent impacts of journey times.

Lying on the convergence of the A361, A342 and A360 has led to **Devizes** suffering from highway congestion that impacts travel through the town, also having a negative impact on the designated AQMA.

The transport connectivity in **Malmesbury** is largely dominated by the A429 which can become congested at peak times.

Melksham's existing transport infrastructure mainly lies with the A350 with other routes including the A3102 and A365. These routes confluence on the A350 which cause significant peak hour congestion and delays, particularly through the town.

Within the **rest of HMA**, links to the highway network vary as do the levels of existing transport capacity. That being said, the majority of settlements in the rest of HMA will likely be less accessible to services and increase the likelihood of increasing usage of transport corridors with lower levels of capacity.

DAQ 3: Make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of certain elements of the existing transport infrastructure in each broad location that could be utilised sustainably if growth were to take place. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise potential efficient use or impacts upon the existing transport infrastructure. More detailed assessment will be possible at the site assessment stage where the potential for utilisation or improvements to the existing transport infrastructure will become clearer.

Highway connectivity within **Calne** lies mainly with the A4 running through the town and A3102 which also runs through the town. These highway links provide bus services to the surrounding settlements. No rail option is present within Calne, the nearest option being Chippenham.

Chippenham's highway links, namely the A350, A4 and A420 offer good options for travel including bus services to the surrounding settlements, some operating from the bus station that provides a bus interchange facility within the town. Chippenham also provides one of the closest locations for access to the M4, which lies just 4 miles north. Chippenham rail station provides links on the Great Western mainline, with this station being well connected to the town centre.

In highway terms, **Corsham** is well served by the A4 providing links further afield, radiating out from this link. This link provides a basis from which bus services operate to serve Corsham, linking to surrounding settlements. No rail link is present within Corsham, the nearest link is Chippenham.

The confluence of the A361, A342 and A360 characterise the transport links present within **Devizes** in highway terms, with bus services utilising these key routes to serve the town. In terms of rail provision, Devizes does not offer strong rail links with no station present within the town while links to existing stations are currently providing well utilised options.

The A429 acts as the main highway link connecting **Malmesbury** to settlements north and south, also acting as it's link to other transport corridors. Subsequently, bus services utilise this link to provide buses to these locations. Malmesbury does not have a rail link itself, the nearest station being Kemble.

Melksham is serviced by the A350 primary route providing links to key surrounding settlements. Other routes, namely the A3102, A365 along with B routes provide links to further surrounding settlements. Bus services utilise these links to provide sustainable means to access these settlements. A railway station is present within Melksham, though services are not as extensive as those offered at the surrounding stations.

The rural nature of the **Rest of the HMA** leads to a large variance in the nature and availability of transport infrastructure, both in public transport and highway terms. Existing sustainable transport infrastructure in the rest of the housing market area is often limited due to the remote location of certain areas with in-frequent public transport services and accessibility. Efficient use of existing transport systems in these locations is consequently more likely to be constrained by the lack of current infrastructure.

DAQ 4: Provide the opportunity to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure including safe active travel?

The below observations provide a brief strategic overview of the existing sustainable transport provision and pedestrian environment in each broad location that provide opportunity for enhancement moving forward. At this stage of appraisal, it is difficult to make notable observations on the precise opportunities to enhance safe active travel without knowing the spatial distribution of growth within each location. More detailed assessment should be possible at the site assessment stage where the opportunities to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure will become clearer.

Within **Calne**, the absence of a railway links means that sustainable transport enhancement would need to come from the provision of bus services. The A4 and A3102 provide the main linkages to the surrounding areas and offer opportunity to further enhance the public transport offer within Calne. Active travel is characterised by national cycle route 403 that passes through the town, with cycle connectivity offered with a direct link to Chippenham. Within the town, the town cycle network plan has been developed to display opportunities.

The railway station in combination with the bus services serving **Chippenham**, offering links to the surrounding settlements utilising the main transport routes radiating from Chippenham, provide opportunity for further enhancement of the public transport options within the town. The bus station is another opportunity to further enhance the utilisation of such services within Chippenham. In safe active travel terms, national cycle route 403 passes through the town which in combination with other links such as regional route 20, provide some options. It is acknowledged that constraints such as the river and railway line can restrict such options. The Chippenham Transport strategy does identify some key routes that can improve the pedestrian and cycle provision.

The highway link provided by the A4, and the bus services operating from this route, offer the main linkages and subsequent opportunities to further enhance bus provision to the surrounding settlements in the absence of a railway link when considering **Corsham**. In safe active travel terms, options such as the Wiltshire cycleway, national cycle route 254 and regional route 20 provide some options. Within the town, the town cycle network plan displays some opportunities and current provision.

Bus services operating on the 3 routes that confluence at **Devizes**, namely the A361, A342 and A360 provide the main opportunities to further enhance bus services operating from Devizes. The possibility to enhance rail usage is limited with no rail link or direct links to rail services present within the town. In active travel terms, national cycle route 4 passes through the town along the canal tow path. The Devizes transport strategy offers further information to enhance provision.

Bus services, namely those operating along the A429 connecting **Malmesbury** to surrounding settlements provide the main opportunity to enhance sustainable transport links to the surrounding settlements. Rail provision is not provided within the town however links to Kemble or Chippenham offer the best opportunities to enhance rail usage. Active travel at a high level is present with the national cycle route 254 and sections of the Wiltshire cycleway passing through the area. The Malmesbury town cycle network plan also highlights provision and opportunities.

Melksham, being served by the A350, A3102 and A365 does offer further opportunities for the enhancement of the public transport offer through the improvements of bus services. The rail link within Melksham also offers opportunity to further enhance rail provision within the town. Active travel options are present in the form of national cycle route 403 with route 4 following the route of the canal. The Melksham town cycle network plan further highlights provision and opportunities within the town.

Within the **Rest of the HMA** there is relatively poor cycle network provision in the rural hinterland and while settlements are connected by Public Rights of Way, the quality and visibility of these routes vary. The bus services are often limited or in-frequent, particularly in more sparsely populated rural areas, though it is acknowledged that growth of towns and villages may offer the opportunity to make some public transport services more viable to these areas.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	At Calne, a higher level of housing growth is proposed within CH-A along with some employment growth. Given existing constraints, this is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	At Calne, a lower level of housing growth is proposed within CH-B in comparison to all other options, along with an employment allocation. This is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects against this objective.	At Calne, a similar level of housing growth to CH-B proposed, but with no employment provision. Given existing constraints, this is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Chippenham is allocated comparatively less in the roll forward. While offering a comparatively wider number of possibilities to enhance sustainability of travel, future growth at this level is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective, given mitigation measures will need to become clearer to combat current constraints and sustainably manage this level of growth.	Focusing development at Chippenham, both housing and employment, provides the opportunity to take advantage of key sustainable transport services. This focus however will need to show how development may mitigate current constraints including congestion and the subsequent impact on both private and public transport. Given this, focusing growth in Chippenham is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective, although effects are considered to be greater and more significant than CH-A or CH-C due to the significantly higher growth. With Chippenham being the focus for growth, strategy CH-B proposes comparatively less	CH-C allocates Chippenham a similar amount to the roll forward. While offering a comparatively wider number of possibilities to enhance sustainability of travel, future growth at this level is currently assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective, given mitigation measures will need to become clearer to combat current constraints and sustainably manage this level of growth.

		growth in the other main settlements in this HMA when compared against the roll forward.	
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	The roll forward allocates a comparatively higher level of growth to Corsham along with a small employment allocation. This is currently assessed as having moderate adverse effects against this objective.	Under this option Corsham is currently assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	Corsham is identified to take a similar level of growth to CH-B but with additional employment. This is currently assessed as having likely minor adverse effects against this objective.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Within Devizes, growth at this proposed rate corresponds to a proportionately high level of growth for the town. This is currently assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects largely due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to minimise negative impacts on the currently congested highway infrastructure.	Devizes proportionately acts as the next settlement for growth within this HMA in strategy CH-B. Growth at this proposed rate is currently assessed as having moderate adverse effects at this location given the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to maximise the sustainability of future growth and associated travel, and negative impacts on the currently congested highway infrastructure.	Strategy CH-C also allocates a proportionately high level of growth to Devizes, similar to CH-B. This proportionately high level of growth is currently assessed as having moderate adverse effects largely due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established to minimise negative effect on the currently congested highway infrastructure.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	At Malmesbury proposed levels of growth are relatively low. Further growth would need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects in this location.	At Malmesbury, while proposed levels of growth are relatively low, further growth would still need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects in this location.	At Malmesbury, proposed levels of growth are relatively low broadly in line with CH-B. Further growth would need to consider its effects on the identified constraints. Currently this level of growth is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects in this location.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	The roll forward of the core strategy allocates a large level of housing growth to Melksham along with a small employment allocation. Currently this is assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects with mitigation options to sustainably manage this level of growth, against identified opportunities and constraints, being unclear.	The lower level of growth allocated to Melksham is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects with mitigation options to sustainably manage this level of growth, against identified opportunities and constraints, being unclear.	Focusing significantly more growth, both housing and employment, in Melksham that is proposed offers the opportunity to capitalise on the sustainable transport options present in this settlement. This will need to be balanced against exacerbating the current constraints identified in this location. This focus for growth in Melksham is currently assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects due to the unknown extent to which mitigation will be established.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	A continuation of the current levels of growth in the rest of HMA may place growth in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to improve the availability of sustainable transport provision and accessibility.	A continuation of the current levels of growth in the rest of HMA are proposed in CH-B, the same levels as proposed in the roll forward. When considering the rest HMA it is acknowledged that this growth may take place in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of	This option significantly increases levels of growth compared with CH-A and CH-B. When considering the rural parts of the HMA it is acknowledged that this may take place in locations with reduced access to sustainable modes of transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to

	Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage; this level of growth in the Rest of HMA would distribute development amongst many settlements over a wide area and therefore at this stage is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects against this objective.	transport. For development to mitigate this effect it would need to improve the availability of sustainable transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage; this level of growth in the Rest of HMA would distribute development amongst many settlements over a wide area and therefore at this stage is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects against this objective.	improve the availability of sustainable transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage; this increased level of growth in the Rest of HMA is assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects against this objective.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.7 The comparatively greater levels of development proposed in Devizes, Chippenham and Melksham and a comparatively large level of growth allocated to Calne, Corsham and Malmesbury lead to likely moderate adverse effects in most settlements. Given the uncertainty surrounding the availability of mitigation measures to minimise negative effects on constraints and provide enhancements in sustainable transport provision in the settlements identified for the focus of growth, at this stage this strategy is assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects against this objective.	-1.3 Focuses growth primarily in Chippenham. Devizes is still allocated a moderate level of growth, but the remaining settlements are all allocated proportionately lower levels of growth. Given the uncertainty surrounding the availability of mitigation measures to minimise negative effects on constraints and provide enhancements in sustainable transport provision at this stage, namely in Chippenham, this strategy is assessed as having likely minor adverse effects against this objective.	-1.6 Focuses significantly more growth in Melksham with a proportionately high level of growth also in Devizes, similar to CH-B. Chippenham is allocated a similar level of growth to CH-A. Given the uncertainty surrounding the availability of mitigation measures to minimise negative effects on constraints and provide enhancements in sustainable transport provision at this stage, namely in Melksham, Devizes and Chippenham, this strategy is assessed as having likely moderate adverse effects against this objective.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

The assessment of the three strategies has found that **CH-B is likely to have minor adverse effects overall and is the more sustainable option.** With Chippenham being the main focus for growth, strategy CH-B proposes comparatively less growth in the other main settlements which means that only minor effects are likely. This enhanced level of growth at Chippenham must be accompanied by transport infrastructure that is effective in reducing issues on the current network whilst providing significant and effective alternatives to the private car to encourage more sustainable forms of transport.

Strategies CH-A and CH-C scored similarly, but **CH-A is likely to have greater adverse effects overall and is the least sustainable option.**

Transport issues within the Chippenham HMA are largely focussed on trying to maximise the use and availability of sustainable modes of transport along with managing levels of congestion on strategic routes and in town centres. In the case of Melksham and Chippenham this is largely centred around the A350. This can impact upon private and public transport, as well as impacting the strategic role of key routes running through each location. Overall, the level of growth proposed across the strategies is considered likely to increase traffic levels generally, and the impact of this must be taken into consideration when considering options moving forward.

Chippenham benefits from good strategic transport links along with access to a wide range of sustainable transport services including a railway and bus station. While it is beneficial to locate development in such locations, the significance of effect for all strategies is reflective of the level of risk that comes with this level of growth in a town that has been identified as suffering from peak time congestion on some key strategic routes along with the town centre.

Growth at Melksham varies across the strategies with CH-A and CH-C seeing the largest levels of identified growth. Melksham is located on the A350 primary route which passes through the town centre which, in combination with the A365 and A3102, can cause delays on the current road layout. This congestion can impact on both private and public transport provision. Melksham does also offer the opportunity of rail travel as a sustainable travel option. It should be acknowledged that the lower levels of growth identified in CH-B may preclude the possibility of highway improvement measures that can sometimes come with greater levels of growth. Similarly, while the impacts of the relatively higher levels of growth identified in CH-A and CH-B have been identified as moderate, this is associated with the risk that comes with this level of development to a town struggling with congestion on a primary route. This uncertainty reflects that the assessment is likely to change once further detail emerges around the sustainability of development in transport terms and the mitigation possible that can vary in different locations with differing levels of development.

Significant new highway infrastructure may be necessary to enable higher levels of growth to take place in the identified settlements to varying extents depending on the exact scale and location of growth.

Mixed-use development proposals are recommended as this will help increase self-containment and reduce need to travel.

More detailed transport assessments may be necessary to understand in detail the impact of certain levels of development on settlements and communities to understand the impacts and possible mitigation measures that can be put in place to improve congestion hot spots and sustainable transport provision.

It is considered key to locate development at locations that make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and can facilitate advancements in the use of sustainable transport. Therefore, favourable locations should be in well-connected areas that benefit from good accessibility to a wide range of sustainable transport options, or in locations that can facilitate improvements in such factors.

Development should contribute to improving sustainable transport networks; this includes linking town centres with development sites as well as linking settlements together. Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment may be required to improve public transport services and safe walking/cycling links, particularly within the town centres.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11: Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth

Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Support the vitality and viability of town centres (proximity to town centres, built up areas, station hub)?

The relationship of new development to town centres, and their immediate and wider rural context, is complex and will also rely on trade from retail and non-retail businesses. Additional growth will inevitably contribute, to some extent, to the vitality and viability of town centres. At this stage, in the absence of specific site options to consider, the proximity of future housing and employment development to the town centres cannot be determined and therefore will not be considered as part of this high-level assessment but will be assessed at later stages.

DAQ 2: Provide a variety of employment land to meet all needs, including those for higher skilled employment uses that are (or can be made) easily accessible by sustainable transport?

The Local Plan Review is at an early stage of preparation and, consequently, details of the distribution and range of employment uses that will be provided is not known. Therefore, for this high-level stage of appraisal it is difficult to make notable distinctions between the options against this objective. It is assumed that these matters would not necessarily be affected by the strategic distribution of employment land and so no conclusions on this aspect of the strategic objective have been made at this stage.

DAQ 3: Contribute to the provision of infrastructure that will help to promote economic growth?

The provision of housing and employment will require sufficient infrastructure to be in place to ensure that it is acceptable. This will largely be achieved through s106 contributions for those directly related to the development. CIL funds and grant funding will ensure the provision of strategic infrastructure. The quantum of homes and employment land to be delivered is the same for

each of the strategies and therefore should result in the contributions towards infrastructure on a similar scale, albeit applicable to specific areas. The provision of infrastructure will need to be considered and tested further at the site options stage.

DAQ 4: Promote a balance between residential and employment development to help reduce travel distances to work?

Wiltshire has large flows of commuters into and out of the county, with an overall net outflow of commuters. The majority of movement is to and from Swindon and Bath & North-East Somerset. 56% of people travel to work by car, 13% by foot and 5% by public transport. Self-containment in Wiltshire is 63%, compared to 74% in Swindon.

The extent that strategies can promote a balance between residential and employment development will, in part, depend on the existing provision in terms of housing stock and employment uses, the relationship between them, and the relationship/connectivity of a settlement with other parts of the HMA/FEMA (which themselves are strongly influenced by travel to work areas) and adjacent areas. The provision of employment development in isolation could, for example, be more likely to lead to an increase in travel distances but not necessarily if it was located in an area of relatively higher rates of unemployment. The same might apply in areas where employment vacancies are high or jobs are expected to increase. This will, however, depend on the extent that the skills base of the unemployed in the local area match that provided by any new employers.

Of the total need of 182ha of employment land identified in the FEMA, a substantial proportion can be met from existing operational employment sites and site allocations leaving 26ha to be met from additional allocations across the county. The residual requirement for employment land for the Chippenham HMA is 9ha.

At **Chippenham** total jobs are up slightly since 2009. There is a high concentration of Public Administration & Defence jobs. Recent investments include ongoing expansion by Good Energy at Monkton Park, a new purpose-built HQ for Woods/Valldata on the last undeveloped site on the Bumpers Farm Estate, Expolink's move to a larger building at Greenways, Wincanton's occupancy of the former Herman Miller facility, and Wavin Group's major factory and stockyard expansion. There is virtually full occupancy of sites/premises, and businesses report a shortage of availability. Chippenham has low levels of unemployment. The SWLEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) identified that the A350 Growth Zone recorded the highest growth in employees amongst all growth zones in 2012-14 (27.4%). There is a very limited supply of existing employment sites and premises available for immediate take up in Chippenham and a lack of affordable sites for development. 19ha of greenfield employment land (to accommodate 50,000m² floorspace) has recently been permitted south west of Chippenham but is yet to be implemented.

At **Malmesbury** total jobs are up significantly since 2009. Wholesale & Retail and Business Services are the most highly concentrated sectors. The dominance of Dyson in the local economy is not apparent from the data, although the JSF highlights its significance. There is ongoing major investment by Dyson at its global RDD campus in the town, supporting a doubling of the workforce, including the new Dyson Academy, and through the acquisition of Hullavington Airfield with the intention to develop a second campus, for battery and new energy vehicle development, although this has not been through the planning process. There is low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates in the town. There are currently limited alternative employment sites available for businesses to locate or existing businesses to expand. The remaining allocated employment site of 1ha in size is currently in use as a garden centre.

At **Calne** total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is a high concentration of Manufacturing jobs. Deceuninck has reopened its 110,000 sq ft warehouse facility at Porte Marsh Industrial Estate to support production growth at its Stanier Road factory. Calne has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. The town has limited capacity for additional retail growth. Part of Beaversbrook employment allocation has been permitted for residential use, resulting in a reduction in available greenfield employment opportunities.

At **Corsham**, total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is a high concentration of employment in the Real Estate, and Information & Communication sectors. ICT presence is reflected in the JSF. Corsham Science Park continues to grow with Bath ASU completing a new purpose built manufacturing and R&D facility, two further buildings have been completed, and a third phase of flexible business units is planned to meet expected market demand. Ark Data Centres have continued to expand their large scale data facilities at Spring Park. The town has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. There are no outstanding employment allocations at the town although there is continued potential for the release of former MoD land to the west.

At **Devizes** total employment has steadily declined since 2009. There is a high concentration of employment in the Public Administration & Defence, Manufacturing, and Construction sectors. The potential for the Manufacturing sector also highlighted in the JSF. Recent larger investments at Hopton Road Trading Estate have included a new-build second production facility for MSA

Latchways, Cross Manufacturing taking a second production building, and ongoing production expansion at Haydens Bakeries. There are low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates. There is an 8.4ha greenfield employment allocation at Horton Road yet to be developed.

At **Melksham** total jobs have grown steadily since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Manufacturing. The business profile in the JSF reflects the strength of the Manufacturing sector. Recent major investments at Bowerhill include the consolidation of Herman Miller's UK manufacturing at its 170,000 sq ft purpose-built Portal Mill facility, and further warehousing/office expansion by Gompels Healthcare; and developments at Hampton Park West including the JLR dealership and hotel and food outlets. Wiltshire Air Ambulance are also constructing and equipping their new airbase located to the south of Hampton Business Park. Melksham has low levels of unemployment and below average town centre shop vacancy rates.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy CH – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy CH – B (Chippenham Expanded Community)	Strategy CH – C (Melksham Focus)
Calne	<p>Under this strategy 5ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne. This would provide capacity for employment at the town to increase, which could potentially result in reducing travel to work distances, taking into account the number of homes delivered at the town in recent years and the stagnation of employment growth over the same period.</p> <p>The higher level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. For this reason, it is assessed that the strategy would have likely moderate positive effects for the town.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 2ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne, lower than for Strategy CH-A but higher than Strategy CH-C. The housing to be allocated under this strategy is, however, lower than for both the alternative development strategies, but will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>Taking into account the relatively high numbers of housing delivered in recent years and the stagnation of employment over the same period, this strategy is therefore predicted to have a minor positive effect overall and compared to Strategies CH-A and CH-C.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Calne. The lack of additional employment land could result in an imbalance with the number of homes delivered in recent years and to be delivered against this strategy (which is not substantially different from strategy CH-B).</p> <p>However, the housing provision will still have benefits by helping to support local businesses, the town centre and providing an increased supply of local labour. For this reason, it is predicted that CH-C would result in likely minor positive effects for the town.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	<p>Under this strategy, no additional employment land would be required at Chippenham. The current strategy for Chippenham is based on delivering significant job growth at the town. Given the supply of outstanding and existing commitments, rolling forward the current strategy without further allocation of employment land is considered unlikely to lead to an imbalance with the additional growth in housing. The significant level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted.</p>	<p>Under this strategy, 7ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Chippenham. This scenario, in combination with the additional homes also being allocated would be likely to result in significant positive effects at the town. The combination of 7ha employment land and a significantly increased level of housing will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide a significantly increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>Strategy CH-B is considered likely to have major positive effects compared to strategies CH-A and CH-C.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Chippenham. However, there would still be a relatively high level of additional employment land provided for the town from existing commitments and this level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. For these reasons a minor positive effect is predicted, the same as strategy A, but would be likely to result in a negative effect compared to Strategy B.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Corsham	At Corsham 2ha of additional employment land and an additional 1,740 homes would be allocated at the	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Corsham (there are	Under this strategy 4ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Corsham. Under this strategy an

	<p>town. Employment has stagnated during recent years whilst delivery of homes has been relatively high over the same period.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>The allocation of additional employment land in combination with the significant additional housing, would therefore be likely to lead to moderate positive effects on this objective.</p>	<p>also no outstanding employment allocations at the town) and a lower amount of additional homes would be allocated which, in combination with existing commitments for homes, is predicted to have likely minor positive effects for the town.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p>	<p>additional 1,365 homes (similar to Strategy B) would be allocated.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>This strategy would allow the potential for employment to increase, more in balance with housing growth, and therefore result in moderate positive effects overall.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
Devizes	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed.</p> <p>The significant level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>A continuation of the existing strategy with the allocation of significant additional homes is therefore likely to result in minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at the Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed.</p> <p>The lower level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>This strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at the Devizes. However, 8.4ha greenfield employment allocated at Horton Road is yet to be developed.</p> <p>This level of housing proposed, similar to CH-B, will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>This strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Malmesbury. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town.</p> <p>There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised.</p> <p>This level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>Consequently, this strategy is likely to result in minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Malmesbury. This is the same as for Strategies CH-A and CH-C. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town. There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>Consequently, this strategy is also likely to result in minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 0ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Malmesbury. This is the same as for Strategies CH-A and CH-B. The employment land available for new and expanding businesses would be limited but this would be consistent with constraints and the relatively low level of additional homes being proposed for the town. There is scope for Dyson to continue to expand but this could put an overreliance on a single key business for the plan aspirations to be realised.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p> <p>Consequently, this strategy is also likely to result in minor positive effects.</p>
	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive

Melksham	<p>Under this strategy 2ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be likely to have a positive effect, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. However, whether this would be sufficient to balance the growth of the significant number of new homes proposed or meet demand from interested businesses is unclear. This level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have likely minor positive effects – benefits would be greater if the level of employment proposed was higher.</p>	<p>Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham and there is a lower provision for new homes. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be likely to have a positive effect, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. This increase in employment seen in recent years may slow, however, depending on scope for expansion within existing businesses. This level of housing proposed will help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have likely minor positive effects – benefits would be greater if the level of employment proposed was higher.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 5ha of additional employment land would be allocated at Melksham and a significant increase in housing. Employment has increased since 2009 and Hampton Park is largely built out so additional employment land would be a positive, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. However, as with Strategy CH-A, whether this would be sufficient to balance the growth of new homes or meet demand from interested businesses is unclear. This significant level of housing proposed will also strongly support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is considered that this strategy would have moderate positive effects. This would be more positive compared to Strategy CH-A and Strategy CH-B.</p>
Rest of HMA	<p>Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-A would have minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-B would have minor positive effects.</p>	<p>Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the Rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing provision of employment land to meet local needs. The level of housing proposed is likely to help to support local businesses, rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore likely that Strategy CH-C would have minor positive effects.</p>
Overall HMA score	<p>1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.</p>	<p>1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.</p>	<p>1.3 Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this strategy.</p>

Conclusions/Recommendations:

This assessment has considered both proposed employment and housing levels in assessing whether strategies will encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth.

Overall, all strategies score equally well, with minor positive effects overall, and **it has not been possible to assess any one strategy as the more sustainable option**. Significant benefits overall are not considered likely for any strategy.

Outstanding commitments in the Chippenham HMA are considered capable of meeting a significant proportion of the need for additional employment land to 2036. Consequently, the differences in the effects of the three strategic options for the distribution of the residual employment land requirement are limited by the relatively small scale of development under consideration. A key consideration has been the aspiration to reduce travel to work distances and achieve a balance between employment and housing growth.

Future employment growth at Devizes, Calne and Corsham should be balanced, commensurate with housing development. Loss of employment land in these areas should be resisted.

The level of housing proposed has also played a part in the assessment because higher levels of housing, whilst it may contribute to out-commuting if there is insufficient local employment opportunities, is also likely to help to support local businesses, town centres and rural services and facilities and provide an increased supply of local labour.

Retention of existing and allocated employment land is often challenging to manage. Consider inclusion of policies that safeguard against incompatible uses or unnecessary loss of employment sites but also set out criteria against which, in exceptional cases, an existing site or allocation that is clearly and demonstrably no longer suitable for employment development can be de-allocated or developed for an alternative use.

SA Annex 1.1 - Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Req 18)

Settlement/area	Emerging Spatial Strategy	
	Housing	Employment (ha)
Calne	1610	4
Chippenham	9225	5
Corsham	815	0
Devizes	1330	0
Malmesbury	665	0
Melksham	3950	0
Rest of HMA	2840	0
TOTAL	20435	9

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 1: Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Avoid potential negative impacts of development on designated wildlife sites, protected species and priority species and habitats (international, national, local) and enhance these where possible? 2. Ensure that all new developments protect Local Geological Sites (LGSs) from development? 3. Aid in the delivery of a network of multifunctional Green Infrastructure?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above.

	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above.
	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.4 Minor adverse effects	
Conclusions/Recommendations:	
Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Corsham, although impacts at Corsham are likely to be less when compared with previous strategies as the housing requirement has reduced to 815 dwellings. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2: Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u>	
1. Ensure efficient use of land? 2. Lead to the reuse of Previously Developed Land where possible/appropriate? 3. Encourage remediation of contaminated land? If so, would this lead to issues of viability and deliverability? 4. Result in the permanent loss of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3a)? 5. Lead to the sterilisation of viable mineral resources? If so, is there potential to extract the mineral resource as part of the development?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above.
	Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This strategy would deliver 225 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above.
	Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Moderate adverse effects considered likely overall as Devizes is the most constrained settlement in the HMA with regards the proportion of BMV agricultural land adjacent to the urban area.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above.
	Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above.
	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.4 Minor adverse effects	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Devizes, although impacts at Devizes are likely to be less when compared with previous strategies as the housing requirement has reduced to 1330 dwellings. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest effects against this objective.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3: Use and manage water resources in a sustainable mannerDecision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Protect surface, ground and drinking water quality? 2. Direct development to sites where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This strategy would deliver 225 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 minor adverse effects	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The area most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Chippenham due to the scale of growth which is likely to lead to significant pressures on the local water network and water protection areas.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4: Improve air quality and minimise all sources of environmental pollutionDecision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Minimise and, where possible, improve on unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration? 2. Minimise effects on and where possible improve air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality (such as AQMAs)? 3. Lie within a consultation risk zone for a major hazard site or hazardous installation?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse effects	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Calne. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest effects against this objective. Calne has an established Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the town centre which may be adversely affected by the level of growth proposed.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)).	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 1. Promote the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy? 2. Be located within Flood Zone 2? If so, are there alternative sites in the area that can be allocated in preference to developing land in Flood Zone 2? (To be determined through the application of the Sequential Test) 3. Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: moderate adverse

Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.4 Minor adverse effects	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Calne. Calne has a moderately high level of growth under this scenario. Any new growth would need to consider the surface water flooding events experienced across the town. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6: Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Conserve or enhance World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks & Gardens, sites of archaeological interest, undesignated heritage assets and their settings? 2. Maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements through high quality and appropriate design, taking into account the management objectives of Conservation Areas?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse

Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Corsham, although impacts at Corsham are likely to be less when compared with previous strategies as the housing requirement has reduced to 815 dwellings. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7: Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 1. Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance nationally designated landscapes and their settings and locally valued landscapes? 2. Protect rights of way, public open space and common land?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse

Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse effects	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham, Corsham and the Rest of the HMA. Impacts at Corsham are likely to be less when compared with previous strategies as the housing requirement has reduced to 815 dwellings. The higher growth for the Rest of the HMA under the emerging strategy when compared with Standard Method may have significant landscape effects due to the presence of large national designations (AONB) as well as locally-valued landscapes.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 8: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 1. Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing? 2. Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community? 3. Deliver high quality residential development?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall benefits considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so benefits are likely to be reduced. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: major positive
Corsham	Overall benefits considered likely to be similar to but with fewer benefits than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy and therefore fewer benefits. Minor positive effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	Overall benefits considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so beneficial effects are likely to be fewer. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: major positive
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse

Overall score: 1.3 minor positive effects

Conclusions/Recommendations:
 Minor benefits likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant benefits are Chippenham and Melksham as they will be delivering the majority of growth. The other settlements will experience fewer benefits as all of the housing requirements are lower than for comparable strategies.
 The Rest of the HMA is likely to experience adverse effects overall as the continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in these parts of the rural area.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 9: Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive communities with better services and facilities.

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)
 1. Maximise opportunities within the most deprived areas? 2. Be accessible to educational, health, amenity greenspace, community and town centre facilities which are able to cope with the additional demand? 3. Promote/create public spaces and community facilities that might support public health, civic, cultural, recreational and community functions? 4. Reduce rural isolation, including access to affordable services for those without a car in rural areas?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so the benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: major positive
Corsham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to but fewer than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor benefits considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so benefits will be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: major positive
Rest of HMA	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor positive

Overall score: 1.6 moderate positive effects

Conclusions/Recommendations:
 Moderate positive effects are likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant beneficial effects against this objective are Chippenham and Melksham as they will be delivering the majority of growth. Beneficial effects at all of the other settlements and rural area are likely to be less as a result of a lower housing requirement.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Promote mixed use developments, in accessible locations, that reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car? 2. Provide suitable access and not significantly exacerbate issues of local transport capacity (unless there is evidence that such impacts can be mitigated)? 3. Make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure? 4. Provide the opportunity to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure including safe active travel?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.3 minor adverse effects	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Chippenham and Melksham as they will be delivering the majority of the growth. Adverse effects at all of the other settlements are likely to be less significant as growth levels are lower.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11: Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Support the vitality and viability of town centres (proximity to town centres, built up areas, station hub)? 2. Provide a variety of employment land to meet all needs, including those for higher skilled employment uses that are (or can be made) easily accessible by sustainable transport? 3. Contribute to the provision of infrastructure that will help to promote economic growth? 4. Promote a balance between residential and employment development to help reduce travel distances to work?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 140 fewer homes and 1Ha less employment land so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: moderate positive
Chippenham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 540 fewer homes and 2Ha less employment land so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: major positive
Corsham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to but less significant than Standard Method Strategy CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	Housing requirement of 1330 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy CH-B which is the most comparable strategy. Minor positive effects considered likely overall. Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 90 fewer homes so benefits are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy CH-C but this emerging strategy is without the 5Ha of employment land so adverse effects are likely to be less significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate positive
Rest of HMA	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be the same as Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to those assessment findings above. Likely effects: minor positive
Overall score: 1.6 moderate positive effects	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Moderate positive effects are considered likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant benefits against this objective are Chippenham, Melksham and Calne. Chippenham and Melksham will be delivering the majority of growth, therefore are likely to experience the greatest benefits against this objective. Calne would be allocated 4Ha of employment land in this emerging strategy which would help local businesses to expand and may attract inward investment. However, the other settlements and rural areas would only have minor benefits from their allocated growth.	

SA Annex 1.1 - Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19)

Settlement/area	Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19)	
	Housing	Employment ¹ (ha)
Calne	1,230	3.2
Chippenham	5,850	15.0
Corsham	360	0
Devizes	980	0
Malmesbury	600	0
Melksham	2,160	5.0
Rest of HMA	2,460	0
TOTAL	13,640	23.2

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 1: Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features and avoid irreversible losses

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Avoid potential negative impacts of development on designated wildlife sites, protected species and priority species and habitats (international, national, local) and enhance these where possible? 2. Ensure that all new developments protect Local Geological Sites (LGSs) from development? 3. Aid in the delivery of a network of multifunctional Green Infrastructure?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-A. Whilst the aforementioned strategy would deliver slightly higher levels of housing than is suggested within the strategy being assessed, once the heightened employment requirement is taken into consideration the overall impact is considered to be similar when assessing the revised spatial strategy against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall significant adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of such effects cannot be ruled out given the constraints present at Corsham. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of negative effects cannot be ruled out. . Likely effects: minor adverse

¹ Employment figures based on actual allocations in Local Plan

Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury, whilst lower than other strategies assessed, is comparable to that present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy for this objective. Overall adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of negative effects cannot be ruled out. . Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Melksham is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B, with the addition of 5ha employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 Minor adverse effect	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall for this revised spatial strategy. The revised spatial strategy scores the least likely to lead to negative effects against this objective compared to all other tested strategies to date. Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Chippenham. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less likelihood of significant adverse effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2: Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 1. Ensure efficient use of land? 2. Lead to the reuse of Previously Developed Land where possible/appropriate? 3. Encourage remediation of contaminated land? If so, would this lead to issues of viability and deliverability? 4. Result in the permanent loss of the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land (Grades 1, 2, 3a)? 5. Lead to the sterilisation of viable mineral resources? If so, is there potential to extract the mineral resource as part of the development?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. Similar number of homes. The additional employment land is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: Moderate adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse

Melksham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Melksham is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to LHNA Strategy CH-B, with the addition of 5ha employment land. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be minor as per LHNA CH-B. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 Minor adverse effect	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects considered likely overall for this revised strategy. This compares with a score of -1.4 against this objective for the assessment of the Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18). Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The only settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Chippenham. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant adverse effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3: Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 1. Protect surface, ground and drinking water quality? 2. Direct development to sites where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. This revised strategy would deliver a similar number of homes. The additional employment land is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury is lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver slightly fewer homes. The additional employment land (5ha) is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A and CH-B above.

Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 minor adverse effect
<p>Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects considered likely overall for this revised strategy, the same score given for the assessment of the Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18). The only settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Chippenham where development is likely to lead to significant pressures on the local water network and water protection areas. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant adverse effects against this objective. The revised strategy proposes 14.2ha employment more than the Emerging Spatial Strategy.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4: Improve air quality and minimise all sources of environmental pollution	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u>	
1. Minimise and, where possible, improve on unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration? 2. Minimise effects on and where possible improve air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality (such as AQMAs)? 3. Lie within a consultation risk zone for a major hazard site or hazardous installation?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. This revised strategy would deliver a similar number of homes. The additional employment land is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury is lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver slightly fewer homes. The additional employment land (5ha) is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 minor adverse effect	
<p>Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects considered likely overall for this revised strategy. This compares with a score of -1.4 against this objective for the assessment of the Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18). Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The only settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Chippenham. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the</p>	

HMA, resulting in less significant adverse effects against this objective. The revised strategy proposes 14.2ha employment more than the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Calne has an established Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the town centre which may be adversely affected by the level of growth proposed.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)).

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Promote the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy? 2. Be located within Flood Zone 2? If so, are there alternative sites in the area that can be allocated in preference to developing land in Flood Zone 2? (To be determined through the application of the Sequential Test) 3. Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. This revised strategy would deliver a similar number of homes. The additional employment land is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. However the town is at notable risk of groundwater flooding, therefore further development would likely have a moderate adverse effect. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury is lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be fewer as a result. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver slightly fewer homes. The additional employment land (5ha) is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse

Overall score: -1.1 minor adverse effect

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor adverse effects considered likely overall for this revised strategy. This compares with a score of -1.4 against this objective for the assessment of the Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18). Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The only settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Devizes. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant adverse effects against this objective. The revised strategy proposes 14.2ha employment more than the Emerging Spatial Strategy.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6: Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u>	
1. Conserve or enhance World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks & Gardens, sites of archaeological interest, undesignated heritage assets and their settings? 2. Maintain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements through high quality and appropriate design, taking into account the management objectives of Conservation Areas?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	The revised spatial strategy proposes less growth in Calne in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B which proposed the same amount of house but 1.2ha less employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B above. Although slightly more employment land is proposed for Calne effects are still considered likely to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing in Chippenham but more employment land in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-C which proposed a similar amount of housing but no employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-C above. As the revised strategy also proposed 15 ha employment land there are less opportunities to avoid effects on assets particularly those at risk at the settlement therefore the likely effects are considered to increase to moderate adverse. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Corsham	The revised spatial strategy for Corsham proposes less housing than all other strategies. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy which proposed 815 dwellings, still more than double the amount now proposed. Refer to the assessment findings for the Emerging Spatial Strategy above. Although the level of housing is reduced there are a number of heritage considerations in and around Corsham and it is therefore considered likely effects are still moderate adverse. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Devizes	The revised spatial strategy for Devizes proposes less housing than all other strategies at 980 dwellings. The nearest comparable strategy is the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B which proposed 1715 dwellings. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B above. Although the amount of housing has reduced effects are still considered to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	The revised spatial strategy for Malmesbury proposes less housing than all other strategies. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy which only proposed 65 more dwellings. Refer to the assessment findings for the Emerging Spatial Strategy above. Effects are considered to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	The revised spatial strategy for Melksham proposes less housing than the emerging spatial strategy but more employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is the Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment) CH-B. Refer to assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment) CH-B. This strategy provides 5ha more employment land than the Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment) CH-B but as Melksham is less constrained for this objective than other settlements in the HMA effects are considered to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The revised spatial strategy for the rest of the HMA proposes less housing than the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-A. Refer to assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method). Effects are considered to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: -1.3 minor adverse	
Conclusions/Recommendations:	
Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall for this revised spatial strategy. The revised spatial strategy is slightly more sustainable than the emerging spatial strategy because effects are now also likely to be minor adverse for Melksham. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely for Chippenham and Corsham.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 7: Conserve and enhance the character and quality of rural and urban landscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place	
Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ) 1. Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance nationally designated landscapes and their settings and locally valued landscapes? 2. Protect rights of way, public open space and common land?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-A. Whilst the aforementioned strategy would deliver slightly higher levels of housing than is suggested within the strategy being assessed, once the heightened employment requirement is taken into consideration the overall impact is considered to be similar when assessing the revised spatial strategy against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-A above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of negative effects cannot be ruled out. Likely effects: minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of negative effects cannot be ruled out. Likely effects: minor adverse
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury, whilst lower than other strategies assessed, is comparable to that present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy for this objective. Overall adverse effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result, albeit certainty of the absence of negative effects cannot be ruled out. . Likely effects: minor adverse
Melksham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Melksham is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B, with the addition of 5ha employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate adverse
Overall score: -1.1 Minor adverse effect	
Conclusions/Recommendations: Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall for this revised spatial strategy. The revised spatial strategy scores the least likely to lead to negative effects against this objective compared to all other tested strategies to date. Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The area considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is the rest of the HMA due to the landscape designations present and the need for careful selection of sites to avoid significant adverse effects. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less likelihood of significant adverse effects against this objective.	

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 8: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures	
Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ) 1. Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing? 2. Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community? 3. Deliver high quality residential development?	
Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	The revised spatial strategy proposes slightly less housing development and employment land in Calne in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B which proposes the same amount of housing but less employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-B above. Effects are considered likely to be neutral. Likely effects: neutral
Chippenham	The revised spatial strategy proposes slightly less housing development in Chippenham in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy but 10ha more employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-C which proposes slightly more housing but no employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-C above. For the level of housing proposed the effects are considered likely to be minor positive. Likely effects: minor positive
Corsham	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing for Corsham than any other strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy which proposed 455 more homes. Refer to the assessment findings for the Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored minor positive. As the level of growth has reduced by 455 homes to 360 homes the level of adorable housing potentially delivered is reduced and the likely effects are considered to be neutral. Likely effects: neutral
Devizes	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing for Devizes than any other strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy which proposed 350 more homes. Refer to the assessment findings for the Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored minor positive. As the level of growth has reduced by 350 homes to 980 homes the level of adorable housing potentially delivered is reduced but as this level of growth the likely effects are considered to still be minor positive. Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing for Malmesbury than any other strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy which proposed 65 more homes. Refer to the assessment findings for the Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored minor positive. Likely effects are considered to be minor positive. Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing for Melksham in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy but more employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is the Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment) CH-B which proposes a similar amount of housing but no employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for the Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment) CH-B. Likely effects are considered to be minor positive. Likely effects: minor positive
Rest of HMA	The revised spatial strategy proposes less housing for the rest of the HMA in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy at 2460 dwellings. The nearest comparable strategy is the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-A which proposed 380 more dwellings. Refer to the assessment findings for the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) CH-A. Likely effects are considered to be minor adverse. Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall score: 0.4 minor positive	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor positive effects are likely overall for this emerging strategy. The strategy is considered to be less sustainable than the emerging spatial strategy due to the decrease in the level of housing provision. Minor positive benefits are likely in Chippenham, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham. Minor adverse effects are likely in the rest of the HMA as the continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in these parts of the rural area.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 9: Reduce poverty and deprivation and promote more inclusive communities with better services and facilities.Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Maximise opportunities within the most deprived areas? 2. Be accessible to educational, health, amenity greenspace, community and town centre facilities which are able to cope with the additional demand? 3. Promote/create public spaces and community facilities that might support public health, civic, cultural, recreational and community functions? 4. Reduce rural isolation, including access to affordable services for those without a car in rural areas?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This Revised Spatial Strategy would deliver the same number of homes and some 1.2ha additional employment land which will help to support local businesses and the economy. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Chippenham	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. This Revised Spatial Strategy proposes a similar number of homes but with the additional 15 ha of employment land proposed this will create opportunities for investment in an area where deprivation is apparent and in associated health services. This additional employment land proposed supports the elevation of the score for this settlement from a minor to moderate positive effect. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: moderate positive
Corsham	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall, minor positive effects are therefore considered likely against this objective. Likely effects: minor positive
Devizes	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall, minor positive effects are therefore likely. . Likely effects: minor positive
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Malmesbury, whilst slightly lower than other strategies assessed, is comparable to that present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy for this objective. Overall, minor positive effects are therefore likely. . Likely effects: minor positive
Melksham	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Melksham, whilst lower than most other strategies assessed is most similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B but with the addition of an additional 5ha of employment land. The additional employment land will help support local businesses and the economy, and will create opportunities for investment in the area and health services, thus supporting the elevation of the score for this settlement from a likely minor to moderate positive effect. Refer to the assessment findings for Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: moderate positive
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Overall score: 1.3 minor positive effects	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely for this Revised Spatial Strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant beneficial effects against this objective are Chippenham and Melksham as they will be delivering the majority of growth in terms of number of homes as well as an amount of employment land. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant positive effects against this objective. The Revised Spatial Strategy proposes 14.2ha more employment land than the Emerging Spatial Strategy, accordingly, this additional employment land delivered will help businesses to expand and may attract inward investment in these areas. This revised strategy is considered slightly less sustainable than the Emerging Spatial Strategy which had a score of 1.6. Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/ areas, minor positive effects are considered likely for this Objective.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choicesDecision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Promote mixed use developments, in accessible locations, that reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car? 2. Provide suitable access and not significantly exacerbate issues of local transport capacity (unless there is evidence that such impacts can be mitigated)? 3. Make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure? 4. Provide the opportunity to create additional sustainable transport infrastructure including safe active travel?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and just 1.2ha more employment. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Chippenham	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C. Similar number of homes. The additional employment land is not likely to significantly add to the impacts against this objective. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-C above. Likely effects: Moderate adverse
Corsham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Devizes	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Malmesbury is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be far fewer as a result. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Melksham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Melksham is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to LHNA Strategy CH-B, with the addition of 5ha employment land. Overall adverse effects are considered likely to be minor as per LHNA CH-B. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Likely effects: Minor adverse
Overall score: -1.1 minor adverse effect	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Minor adverse effects considered likely overall for this revised strategy. This compares with a score of -1.3 against this objective for the assessment of the Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18). Therefore, this revised strategy is considered more sustainable for this objective. The only settlement considered most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this

objective is Chippenham. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant adverse effects against this objective.

Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11: Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

1. Support the vitality and viability of town centres (proximity to town centres, built up areas, station hub)? 2. Provide a variety of employment land to meet all needs, including those for higher skilled employment uses that are (or can be made) easily accessible by sustainable transport? 3. Contribute to the provision of infrastructure that will help to promote economic growth? 4. Promote a balance between residential and employment development to help reduce travel distances to work?

Settlement/Area	Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
Calne	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B. This revised strategy would deliver the same number of homes and some 1.2ha additional employment land which will help to support local businesses, the town centre and the economy. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B above. Overall, minor positive effects are likely. Likely effects: Minor Positive
Chippenham	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Chippenham are similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-C, being only 65 dwellings less. However, under this revised strategy, 15ha of additional employment land would be allocated to Chippenham, which is far greater than any of the other strategies assessed and is most similar to Standard Method Strategy CH-B and Local Housing Needs Assessment CH-B resulting in major positive effects for Chippenham, supporting local business, the town centre and significantly increasing the level of available local labour. Reference should be made to the findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-B, CH-C and Local Housing Needs Assessment CH-B above. Owing to the amount of employment land proposed under this Revised Spatial Strategy an overall, a major positive effect is therefore likely. Likely effects: Major Positive
Corsham	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Corsham is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall positive effects are considered less likely against this objective as a result albeit certainty of the positive effects cannot be ruled out. Overall, a minor positive effect is likely. Likely effects: Minor Positive
Devizes	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Devizes is significantly lower than all other strategies assessed, with the most comparable assessment for this objective being present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Overall positive effects are likely to be fewer as a result. Overall, a minor positive effect is likely. Likely effects: Minor Positive
Malmesbury	The number of homes in this Revised Spatial Strategy for Malmesbury, whilst slightly lower than other strategies assessed, is comparable to that present within the assessment for the Emerging Spatial Strategy for this objective. Overall, a minor positive effect is likely. . Likely effects: Minor Positive
Melksham	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Melksham, whilst lower than most other strategies assessed is most similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment Strategy CH-B but with the addition of an additional 5ha of employment land. The addition of the employment land would be likely to have an increased positive effect, particularly given the strong links with the A350 transport corridor. The additional employment land elevates this assessment to a likely moderate positive effect. Likely effects: Moderate Positive
Rest of HMA	The number of homes in this revised strategy for Rest of HMA is lower than most other strategies assessed and similar to Standard Method Strategies CH-A and CH-B. Minor adverse effects overall. Refer to the assessment findings for Standard Method Strategy CH-A and CH-B above. Likely effects: minor positive
Overall Score: 1.4 Minor Positive effect	

Conclusions/Recommendations:

Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely for this revised strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant beneficial effects against this objective are Chippenham and Melksham as they will be delivering the majority of growth in terms of number of homes as well as an amount of employment land. When compared with the Emerging Spatial Strategy, housing numbers are significantly lower for every settlement/area, with the housing total 6,795 fewer across the HMA, resulting in less significant positive effects against this objective. However, the Revised Spatial Strategy proposes 14.2ha more employment land than the Emerging Spatial Strategy, accordingly, this additional employment land delivered will help businesses to expand and may attract inward investment in these areas. This Revised Spatial Strategy is considered slightly less sustainable than the Emerging Spatial Strategy, which had a score of 1.6. Overall, taking into account the assessment across all settlements/ areas, minor positive effects are therefore considered likely for this Objective.