

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

**Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)** - Rolling forward the core strategy with employment allocations in Salisbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall.

**Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)** – Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall constrained to reflect current commitments (0), while rest of HMA reflects assessed need (i.e. -11%). The rest is directed to Salisbury (about 5,400 to 6,700).

**Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)** - housing at Amesbury and Tidworth and Ludgershall reflect current commitments, Salisbury reflects assessed need (i.e. -11%). Remainder focused on rural area.

**Strategy SA – D (New Community)** - Housing at all settlements is constrained to commitments. Recognises employment growth at Boscombe and Porton and directs housing growth to a new community related to this economic potential.

<b>Proposed distribution of housing and employment requirements – Salisbury HMA</b>								
<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)</b>		<b>Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)</b>		<b>Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)</b>		<b>Strategy SA – D (New Community)</b>	
	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Employment</b>
Amesbury	2070	0	1230	0	1230	0	1230	0
Salisbury/Wilton	5140	8	6345	10	5140	3.5	4675	2
Tidworth/Ludgershall	1485	2	1210	0	1210	0.5	1210	0
New Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	2000	8
Rest of HMA	1770	0	1685	0	2890	6	1560	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10470</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10470</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10470</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10470</b>	<b>10</b>

**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?**

The River Avon SAC/SSSI runs through Wilton from the north and west into Salisbury which acts as a significant EPS hotspot for otters, Desmoulin's whorl snail, bats and non-EPS protected species including water vole and Schedule 1 birds. However, development within the catchment of the River Avon SAC will be constrained by the Memorandum of Understanding with Environment Agency and Natural England implemented to prevent negative effects on the SAC due to phosphates. The Porton Down SPA lies 7km to the north east, Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA lies 12km north and the New Forest SPA roughly 10km to the south. Depending on the location of growth, additional housing may lead to increased recreational disturbance upon breeding birds on Salisbury Plain and in the New Forest. Furthermore, Bemerton Health & Barnard's Folly LNR and Avon Valley LNR lie within or adjacent to Salisbury. With regards to non-statutory designations, there are numerous CWSs and areas of priority habitat/HPI nearby.

With regards to statutory designations, the River Avon SSSI/SAC runs north to south on the west side of Amesbury. Furthermore, part of Salisbury Plain SSSI/SPA lies approximately 2km to the east. There are also a number of non-statutory designations including Boscombe Down Railway Line CWS and several other CWSs associated with the river floodplain to the west.

There are also some protected species hotspots, namely for water voles, otters, crayfish and birds associated with the River Avon and Stone Curlew plots on arable land near Amesbury.

With regards to statutory designations, the Salisbury Plain SSSI/SAC/SPA lies to the immediate west of Tidworth. Furthermore, allocations at Ludgershall are within the visitor catchment of the Salisbury Plain and therefore pose a risk through recreational pressure particularly when considered in combination without other planned growth and projects such as the Army Basing Programme (ABP).

Some areas in the Rest of the HMA are designated SSSIs, SACs, and/or SPAs or contain important habitats including ancient woodland. This includes the Salisbury Plain SSSI/SPA, River Avon SSSI/SAC and Porton Down SPA/SSSI.

At Porton-Boscombe Down, there is Salisbury Plain SPA/SAC/SSSI to the north, the River Avon SSSI/SAC to the west, Porton Down SPA/SAC to the east, and Porton Meadows SSSI in the vicinity. The area also lies in close proximity to the non-statutory designations of Boscombe Down Railway Line LWS, Idmiston Down LWS and Countess Farm Swamp LWS.

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

There are no LGSs (formerly Regional Sites of Geological Importance, or RIGs) in close proximity to the market towns in the Salisbury HMA.

**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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
Amesbury	Due to the ecologically sensitive designations in proximity to Amesbury and moderately high levels of housing growth proposed for the	SA-B proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given	SA-C proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given	SA-D proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.

	settlement, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Core Strategy Continued proposes moderately low growth levels for Salisbury, albeit with an additional quantum of employment land. Due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, a moderate adverse effect is indicated.	Under SA-B the highest level of growth is directed at Salisbury – six times higher than for Core Strategy Continued. Owing to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely.	SA-C proposes a moderately low level of housing growth – commensurate with Core Strategy Continued - for Salisbury. In combination with the employment land proposed, and due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely.	Growth levels proposed at Salisbury/Wilton in all strategies are considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Despite Core Strategy Continued proposing moderate levels of growth for Tidworth and Ludgershall, a moderate adverse effect is indicated due to the potential recreation impact on the Salisbury Plain SSSI/SAC/SPA.	SA-B proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-C proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	Lower level of growth to SA-A. Likely minor adverse effects due to the potential recreational impacts on the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	At Porton-Boscombe Down there are a number of statutory designations likely to be in close proximity. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the potential precise location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of effect on this objective. Further ecological assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. However, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of ecological sensitivity. However, as at this stage no sites have been	Due to the broad geographical area associated with Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However, as at this	Due to the broad geographical area covered by Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of biodiversity sensitivity. However, under SA-C, growth	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

	identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are indicated.	stage, no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are deemed likely.	quanta for the rural areas would be twice those of alternatives, including Core Strategy Continued. For this reason, moderate adverse effects on this objective are more likely.	have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are indicated.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.75 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 Minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, Strategy **SA-D scores marginally better and is the most sustainable strategy against this objective.**
- Strategy **SA-A is considered the least sustainable option** with significant adverse effects likely in Amesbury, Salisbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall.
- Biodiversity issues in the Salisbury HMA are mainly focused on the Salisbury Plain SPA/SAC and SSSI and the River Avon SAC, which are likely to be a factor in decisions on any future development locations. This is particularly noteworthy in the Salisbury/Wilton area where the highest levels of growth are proposed, being the Principal Settlement – for this reason, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all growth scenarios at Salisbury.
- Adverse impacts are likely in relation to all settlements as there are a considerable number of important ecological designations in the area. The location of any new development sites is not known at this stage and so a more precise likelihood of effects is difficult to predict.
- With regard to further work, a New Forest Visitor Survey will need to be commissioned for development in the visitor catchment distance of the New Forest SPA and the Salisbury Plain Mitigation Strategy should be updated in light of new evidence and changes to projected growth in the visitor catchment of the SPA.
- At the current time, the Environment Agency and Natural England advise that all development within the River Avon catchment should be ‘phosphate neutral’ for an interim period until 2025. Beyond this time an approach will take account of water company planning, as well as latest Government policy and legislation. This is to guard against a further worsening of the condition of the River Avon SAC. An annex of the Nutrient Management Plan will explain measures to help deliver phosphate neutral development and how they will be delivered.

**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 land surrounding the built-up area of Salisbury is classified as Grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land, with some spokes of Grade 4 (poor) extending outwards around the River Bourne, Avon and Nadder. There are also some small patches of Grade 2 to the north west, north east, south east and south.

At Amesbury, while the area around the River Avon which runs from north to south on the western side of the settlement is classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, the majority of land within and outside Amesbury is Grade 3 apart from patches of Grade 2 to the north and north east.

While Tidworth lies in an area of non-agricultural land, Ludgershall is surrounded by mainly Grade 3 agricultural land with the western side being non-agricultural.

Excluding the urban areas, the majority of the Rest of the HMA including potentially the area of Porton – Boscombe Down is classified as being Grade 3 agricultural land, with some strips of Grade 2 and Grade 4 land around the rivers. The majority of Grade 2 land lies within the Tisbury Community Area.

**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?**

With regards to mineral resources, there is a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) covering the east of Wilton and west of Salisbury, and another covering the south east of Salisbury.

There is a Mineral Resource Block extending north from Amesbury along the River Avon.

There is a Mineral Resource Block to the south of Tidworth.

There are some MSAs, particularly in the Tisbury and the Southern Wiltshire Community Areas, as well as some strips of Minerals Resource Blocks.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
Amesbury	This strategy proposes a much higher level of housing growth proportional to the settlement. This strategy will likely require development of more greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to CH-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to CH-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to CH-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
Salisbury	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.

	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	In the Porton/Boscombe Down area, whilst the airfield is military land and non-agricultural, the rest of the area would pose a risk of losing BMV land. However, the military site may be an area of potential contamination risk. While this presents the opportunity for remediating contaminated land, this could affect the viability and deliverability of the site, were this land to be developed. Overall, as greenfield land and agricultural land could well be required for the development, a minor adverse impact on this objective is deemed likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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 presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects are dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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 equal quantum to the roll forward and would therefore be likely to lead to a similar effect.	This strategy proposes a much higher quantum of growth than the other strategies and is therefore likely to lead to greater effects. Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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. Moderate adverse effects are likely.	Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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. A lower level of growth is proposed through this strategy and it is therefore likely that a lesser effect would result from this strategy.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

Overall HMA score	-1.25 Minor adverse	-1.25 Minor adverse	-1.5 Moderate adverse	-1.2 Minor adverse
-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with greater adverse effects likely.
- 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 and will potentially lead to the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 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 negative effects will occur in all strategies.
- Uncertainties also exist regarding the potential for negative effects on mineral resources and the potential for contaminating and remediating land.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall, and possibly the Boscombe Down element, present areas which are less constrained in the context of objective 2 due to tracts of military land, therefore implying a lower risk of agricultural land loss.
- As Strategy SA-C focuses a much higher level of development around Rest of HMA, it is likely to result in the diffuse loss of greenfield/BMV land.
- Strategy SA-B, with its' greater focus on Salisbury, is also likely to lead to significant adverse effects at Salisbury. It is known that there is comparatively little scope for re-use of PDL in Salisbury. However, all strategies, given the main focus of growth at the Principal Settlement, are considered likely to have significant effects.
- To achieve better sustainability outcomes against this objective, new development should try to maximise use of PDL and avoid areas of BMV, where possible. And development at higher densities would help to reduce loss of greenfield land.
- The majority of the HMA is Grade 3 land. Therefore, in order to identify which areas are more suitable for development and less likely to lead to adverse effects, further assessment is likely to be needed to distinguish between Grade 3a land and Grade 3b land.

**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?**

Salisbury/Wilton is surrounded by several Source Protection Zones. These are a mix of Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 (Total Catchment). These are positioned to the east/north east of Salisbury, beyond Laverstock; to the north of Salisbury, beyond Old Sarum; to the west of Salisbury, north of Wilton; and to the south west of Wilton. There is one Drinking Water Protection Area to the south/south east of Salisbury. Additionally, there is a Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface) to the east of Salisbury and a Drinking Water Safeguarding Area (Groundwater) to the north of Salisbury and to the south west of Wilton.

Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east. This is a Zone 3 (Total Catchment Zone). Further to the south a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) are apparent.

Boscombe/Porton has a Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) to the west and north west. This is to the south east of Amesbury. Further to the south of Amesbury is a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater).

Tidworth/Ludgershall is subject to large amount of water protection. Tidworth and its surrounds are covered by Source Protection Zones: Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone), Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and Zone 3 (Total Catchment). Additionally, a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) is apparent. Ludgershall and its surrounds are subject to a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Surface Water). This spreads beyond the settlement to the south. Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) is apparent to the east of the settlement.

While there are rural areas in the HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Areas, there are also plenty of areas in the countryside where development could occur without posing 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?**

Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025. This is expected to lead to an extension of the operational site. There is a moderate probability that rolling forward the current strategy would require construction works to accommodate development.

At Amesbury, there are currently no plans to invest further into the water network by Wessex Water, as works to increase capacity were undertaken prior to 2015. There is a significant probability that rolling forward the current strategy would require construction works to accommodate development.

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.

Wessex Water have not outlined any plans to invest in the local water network at Tidworth/Ludgershall.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth proposed,	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. Due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.



	moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This strategy proposes a higher level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. Due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The main concerns with a new settlement at Boscombe/Porton relate to the potential impacts on the water network capacity. There are currently no plans to invest further into the local water network by Wessex Water at Amesbury, which is the closest settlement positioned near to Boscombe/Porton. However, this strategy proposes high levels of growth that would require new infrastructure. As a result, it is likely there could be moderate adverse effects. This strategy proposes growth in a different location to those which form part of the current strategy and so an increased effect on this area is likely in comparison.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, minor adverse effects are the Rest of the HMA is considered likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect on the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. This strategy proposes the equivalent of SA-A and therefore a similar effect is likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a moderate adverse effect in the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. Furthermore, as this strategy proposes the highest level of housing and employment growth in the Rest of the HMA, the risk of negative impacts occurring in the rural areas is greater.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect in the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. This strategy proposes a lower level of growth when compared to SA-A and SA-B and so a lesser effect is likely.

	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.5 moderate adverse effect	-1.5 moderate adverse effect	-1.75 moderate adverse effect	-1.6 moderate adverse effect

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are the most sustainable strategies** against this objective as they will have fewer adverse effects.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- 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 that area. 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.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is the settlement which is considered to be the most constrained with regards to the protection of water resources, as the areas has a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and Wessex Water have not outlined any plans to invest in the local water network at Tidworth/Ludgershall.
- Recent improvements were made at Amesbury to increase capacity of the local water network. In addition to this, there are planned investments by Wessex Water to reduce phosphates and increase capacity of the water network at Salisbury.
- Development at the rural areas 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.

**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)?**

Salisbury/Wilton currently has 3 long standing AQMAs for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide. Traffic in the area has decreased by 8%. Air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock.

The most recent assessment of Amesbury found that the settlement faces no air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. The settlement continues to be monitored, however.

Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing any air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. Diffusion tubes to monitor were introduced to each town in 2019.

The growth allocated within the rest of the HMA may place development in locations where increases in other pollutants such as noise and light may occur, in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and a lack of public transport provision suggests that development in these areas may lead to an increase number of private car journeys magnifying the likelihood of adverse effects from pollutants from vehicles.

A new community in Boscombe/Porton would be likely place pressure on air quality in the locality and would be placed in a location where there is currently no monitoring being undertaken. It is unclear whether it would lead to an exceedance of nitrogen dioxide in the area at this stage.

**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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Minor adverse effects likely.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Minor adverse effects likely.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Minor adverse effects likely.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	Boscombe/Porton is not currently subject to any AQMAs, but a new community would impact on local air quality due to increased levels of traffic. New development will also

				increase local levels of noise and light pollution. Amesbury is the nearest settlement to Boscombe/Porton. As identified above, Amesbury was most recently assessed as facing no air quality issues and no AQMAs have been declared, but the current AQS requires an update. As no specific location is known, minor adverse effects are considered likely at this stage.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.	This strategy proposes a much higher level of growth than the other strategies. Therefore, effects are likely to be significantly greater. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects on objective 4.	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.2 minor adverse effect</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective as it will have fewer adverse effects overall.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- All development strategies lead to additional development and are therefore likely to lead to increased environmental pollution in all locations. However, as development locations are not known, likely effects and potential mitigation measures are difficult to predict.
- All strategies in Salisbury are considered likely to result in significant adverse effects because of the scale of growth and the fact that Salisbury already has considerable pressures on the local transport network and three existing AQMAs. There are no other AQMAs identified within this HMA.
- At Porton/Boscombe Down, there may be opportunities to ensure that effects on this objective are minimised in line with the Wiltshire Air Quality Strategy, particularly in locations where there are no existing AQMAs apparent. However, there is some risk that introducing large scale development here could lead to air quality issues, particularly in the Boscombe/Porton area where there are identified pinch points that are not yet monitored for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide.
- 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 policies that promote development of sustainable transport links, promote housing development in sustainable locations and increasing on site vegetation in order to provide carbon sinks.
- It is recommended that where development takes place, improvements in sustainable transport options should be sought to alleviate air quality concerns. Development should consider walking and cycling friendly design that promotes and improves safety for these methods.
- With regards to noise and light 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 will 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 flooding form part of the settlement-level analysis below. The cumulative effect of development was also considered in order to identify those catchments where an increase in flows as a result of development would have the greatest effect 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:

Salisbury is at high risk of river flooding and at low risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

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

Tidworth-Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. This lower level of development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk	Tidworth-Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water

	surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The potential for a new settlement presents opportunities to find strategic solutions to constraints. A new settlement in the Boscombe Down/ Porton area could have this advantage as regards flood resilience. There are areas of flood risk associated with the River Bourne that flows to the south and east of Boscombe Down. At this stage, the precautionary approach is required since Amesbury itself has surface water issues. Minor adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are likely.	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are signalled.	Under this strategy substantial growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. However, given this increased level of growth and that many rural settlements are located on rivers and have flood issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are signalled.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.2 minor adverse effect</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- Whilst all areas across Salisbury HMA demonstrate some areas at risk of flooding, the most constrained location is Salisbury/Wilton. All strategies propose a significant amount of growth at Salisbury and therefore there is a likelihood of significant effects at Salisbury/Wilton.
- SA-C proposes a significant increase in growth in the rural part of the HMA and therefore, because many rural settlements are located on rivers and have flood issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely. However, likely effects will depend on any future location of development.
- A new settlement in the broad Porton/Boscombe Down area offers opportunities that could promote flood resilience and could offer strategic solutions to flooding elsewhere.

**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 reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, these will be appraised in more detail at site-specific stage. At this strategic stage in/around the settlements the following is to be noted.

Salisbury: Growth in/around Salisbury would notably impact upon heritage assets including Salisbury Cathedral / setting, Old Sarum scheduled monument and the city's conservation areas and settings. Development in/around nearby Wilton would notably impact upon assets including Wilton House GR1 listed building, Wilton Park registered park & garden, the conservation area and St Mary & Nicholas Church scheduled monument.

Amesbury: adverse impacts could result against important heritage features, including the Abbey/setting, and the setting of the World Heritage Site to the town's west.

Tidworth-Ludgershall: Ludgershall has its Castle (scheduled monument) and a historic core conservation area with numerous listed buildings and their respective settings. Tidworth, meanwhile, includes the designed settings of Tidworth House and Tidworth Barracks.

**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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	It is likely that the level of growth proposed would have moderate adverse effects which would be difficult to mitigate. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.

	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The new community would be a significant sized development. Depending on the location, it may be possible to avoid significant effects on heritage assets. However, the Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including WHS. At this current stage, moderate adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.	Development under SA-C is significantly higher than the other strategies. The proposed quantum of development may be difficult to accommodate in the rural area and moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>



<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.6 moderate adverse effect</b>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective.
- **Strategy SA-C is the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely and an overall moderate adverse effect.
- Given the number and importance of heritage designations around Salisbury and Amesbury, all of the strategies are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects in those settlements given the scale of growth proposed.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is considered less constrained for new development in heritage terms where minor adverse effects are considered likely across all strategies.
- For a new settlement in the Boscombe Down/Porton area, there would be a number of considerations as to its location, as the Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including the World Heritage Site. At this current stage, without further knowledge of the location of this new settlement, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.

**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. At this stage it is important to note the following at the settlements.

Salisbury: the settlement, with Wilton, is surrounded by valued landscapes and, to the south-west Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB, meaning that any development locations would need to be selected with diligence.

Amesbury: adverse impacts could occur against important landscape features, not least amongst which the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) as well as Amesbury Abbey and Park, which lie to the town's immediate west.

Tidworth-Ludgershall: Ludgershall is set within an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed and sensitive to large-scale development. Northwards lies the North Wessex AONB. To the north and west of Tidworth, meanwhile, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain soon becomes evident and would require consideration.

**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.

<b>Settlement/ Area</b>	<b>Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – D (New Community)</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	The eastern side of Amesbury has less landscape constraints - there are no specific landscape designations. However, other parts of the town are more sensitive and in closer proximity to the WHS and Amesbury Abbey and Park. This strategy proposes a	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is considered more likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects.	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is considered more likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects.	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is considered more likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects. Minor effects are considered likely overall.

	much higher level of growth and moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Minor effects are considered likely overall.	Minor effects are considered likely overall.	
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	It is likely that a new settlement of this scale in the Porton/Boscombe Down area could have significant landscape impacts. There is the potential to adversely affect the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) and its 'outstanding universal value' through factors that include inter alia light pollution. Development on the upper slopes of the chalk landscape would be highly visible. The area south-east of Amesbury occupies and is surrounded by a special landscape area (Salisbury SLA). These factors combine to suggest likely significant adverse effects. However, depending on location, it is

				considered that landscape-scale mitigation would be feasible, indicating moderate adverse effects for a new community overall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-A growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-B growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-C growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-D growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	<b>-1.6 moderate adverse effect</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-B and SA-C score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective.
- **Strategy SA-A is the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- It is considered that the level of growth proposed in all strategies for Salisbury is likely to have significant adverse effects. There is potential for significant impacts and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. There are also a number of village conservation areas outside the city that could be harmed.
- Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall are considered to be less constrained in landscape terms and could accommodate proposed growth, depending on the location, whilst avoiding significant effects on the World Heritage Site and North Wessex Downs AONB.
- Significant adverse effects are considered likely for any new settlement of the size proposed in the Porton/Boscombe Down area with potential for impacts on the World Heritage Site and Special Landscape Area. However, development on this scale could also offer opportunities for landscape-scale mitigation such as Green Infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement. It is suggested that the new settlement location be the subject of further analysis to assess whether it could be sustainably designed without detriment to surrounding landscapes and assets.

**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 housing in Salisbury and Wilton has been below planned rates, mainly due to delays in strategic allocations coming forward for development, although they have been exceeding delivery expectation in recent years. 26% of homes built at Salisbury during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 were affordable housing, against a target of 40%. However, delivery of the strategic housing allocation at Laverstock and Ford in the Southern CA increases this to 63%. Only 10% were affordable at Wilton, well below target levels. The house price to earnings ratio is now 11.93 for Wilton and 9.05 for Salisbury.

At Amesbury the ratio of house price to earnings is relatively stable and at 9.18 is marginally lower than in 2008. 34.6% of homes delivered at the town during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 were affordable, above minimum target levels.

Housing delivery at Tidworth and Ludgershall has been below planned rates but the full housing requirement for the settlements is expected to be delivered by 2026 through existing commitments. House price to earnings has risen in the past 10 years but, at 8.3 remains below the Wiltshire average. Affordable housing delivery has been 21.2% which is well below the minimum target of 30% for the area.

For the rest of the housing market area (the rural area) homes have been delivered at or above expected levels with the exception of the Tisbury area which has experienced below planned levels of development. Affordability ratios are, however, higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years.

The updated housing requirement means that growth for the HMA will be lower (by approximately 1,400 homes) than the number of homes allocated for 2006 – 2026 under the WCS.

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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
Amesbury	The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy A is lower than that in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 841 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 Amesbury.	The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy B is the same as for Strategies C and D, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be a residual requirement of 1 dwelling under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period, although the extent that this would happen is uncertain. 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 Amesbury.	The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy C is the same as for Strategies B and D, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be a residual requirement of 1 dwelling under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. 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 Amesbury.	The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy D is the same as for Strategies B and C, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be a residual requirement of 1 dwelling for the town under this scenario. However, this scenario does include the provision of a new community of 2,000 dwellings in the Porton/ Boscombe Down area, which could be close to Amesbury. If this is the case it is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Amesbury in the longer term. Due to the lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period. If the new community is located away from

				Amesbury, effects would be dependent on the types of employment and jobs that will be provided at this location as part of the wider development of the area. For this reason, the effects are predicted as minor positive.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving 239 additional dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This rolls forward a lower level of growth than in the current WCS. It is unclear whether existing commitments would provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving an additional 1,444 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This is a marginally higher level of growth than in the current WCS. 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 Salisbury/Wilton.	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving 239 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This is a lower level of growth than in the current WCS, and the same as for Strategy A. It is unclear whether existing commitments would provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.	The housing requirement for Salisbury under this scenario is the lowest of the four strategic options. Existing commitments would deliver the full housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton up to 2036 with no residual requirement. Existing commitments would be unlikely to provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	The residual requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall would be 275 dwellings which would mean that the rate of house building could drop notably for the latter part of the plan period under this scenario. 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 Tidworth and Ludgershall.	The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy B is the same as for Strategies C and D - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.	The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy C is the same as for Strategies B and D - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.	The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy D is the same as for Strategies B and C - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	This strategy includes the provision of a new community of 2,000 dwellings in the Porton/Boscombe Down area. It is considered that the scale of growth would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes in the HMA in the longer term and could also benefit Amesbury which sees a significant drop in its requirement in this strategy. Due to the lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 885 dwellings under this scenario. 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. 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.	Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 800 dwellings under this scenario. Under Strategy B the housing requirements for 2016 – 2036, to be met at small and large villages, would be similar to that in the current WCS (the same as Strategy A). 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.	Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 2,005 dwellings under this scenario. Under Strategy C the housing requirement would be significantly higher than the other strategies, to be delivered at small and large villages in the HMA. This is significantly more than allocated in the WCS for the current plan period. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is limited by appropriate site size but this significant increase is likely to be positive overall against this objective	Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of 1,020 dwellings under this scenario. The housing requirements for 2016 – 2036 under this strategy would mean a housing requirement to be met at small and large villages lower than that in the current WCS. 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.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>0 neutral effect</b>	<b>-0.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-0.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>0 neutral effect</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-D score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective. Both strategies are likely to have a neutral effect on this objective.
- **Strategies SA-B and SA-C score equally and are considered the least sustainable strategies.** Both strategies are likely to have a minor adverse effect on this objective.
- None of the strategies under consideration are likely to be positive against this objective. This is because there has been an overall drop in the requirement for the HMA compared with the current plan period. Existing commitments in many cases have led to a zero or small residual requirement which would not provide a consistent supply up to 2036. To increase the benefits for affordable and market housing provision in this HMA, the overall requirement would need to be significantly higher.

- 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 total number of homes being planned for in each ADS is also the same for each scenario, meaning that the difference in effects between them will not be major.
- However, overall the housing requirement for the Salisbury HMA is lower (by approx. 1,400 dwellings) than for the current plan period. Given that the % of affordable homes delivered against the current plan requirement has been below target levels, the housing requirement for this HMA against the next plan period is therefore unlikely to address any shortfall in provision of affordable homes. This is primarily because existing commitments are likely to be built out before the end of the plan period, potentially creating a slowdown in housing construction (and provision of affordable homes) in the HMA during the latter half of 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?**

Salisbury/Wilton are subject to area of high deprivation, with 13% of the population living in area with high deprivation scores. It is the only settlement in the Salisbury HMA that is subject to an area of deprivation.

Older people in Salisbury/Wilton, Tidworth/Ludgershall and Amesbury are more at risk of social isolation than Wiltshire as a whole.

A higher proportion than the Wiltshire average of younger people within Salisbury/Wilton and Tidworth/Ludgershall are living within low income families and/or are being supported by the Common Assessment Framework (CAF).

Additionally, a higher than Wiltshire average proportion of 0-25 year olds in Tidworth/Ludgershall are supported by social care.

In the Rest of the HMA, a higher proportion than the Wiltshire average of children in Downton and Whiteparish are currently supported by CAF.

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

Amesbury is served by a health care centre, which is currently experiencing a gap (-88m<sup>2</sup>) in provision. This gap is expected to increase to -213m<sup>2</sup> by 2026 and development commitments are expected to put pressure on existing services. Stonehenge School and Avon Valley College are currently undergoing expansion to meet known demand for school places in the area. Substantial levels of development (around 7000 new homes) would be able to support a new secondary school in the area. The needs of up to 1000 homes could be accommodated at Avon Valley College and additional expansion could be an opportunity.

Current educational facilities are under pressure and the expansion of Stonehenge School is underway to meet existing known demand. A new local primary school is due to open and additional opportunities for expansion are available, but growth upwards of 350 new homes would require new provision.

At Salisbury/Wilton there is capacity identified across the secondary schools and some surplus capacity among primary schools. A new primary school has been secured, in addition, in supply of places is forecast from 2024 onwards as planned expansion will meet known demand. Health centres are located within both Salisbury and Wilton, providing a range of services. Substantial levels of growth would require the provision of new facilities, but identifying suitable land may be difficult. The healthcare centre in Salisbury is currently subject to a shortfall in provision (-227m<sup>2</sup>). This gap is expected remedied by the redevelopment of Salisbury City surgery. An additional surgery could come forward at Old Sarum.

Wellington Academy, which serves Tidworth/Ludgershall is currently being expanded to meet the needs of demand of army basing and new civilian housing in the area. However, further expansion to meet emerging known demand is expected to be needed by 2023. There is a risk that school could become very large. Higher levels of growth (around 4500 new homes) are more likely to be able to support new provision. New primary provision is currently being built and there is scope for a small amount of expansion at Clarendon Infant and Junior School. Beyond this,

there is limited opportunity to expand existing primary provision. As a result, modest growth could be accommodated in existing provision, but higher levels of growth would require new primary provision. There are currently no issues considered, but this is expected to change in the near future as a result of army rebasing.

In the Rest of the HMA, Downton and Whiteparish are currently subject to a gap in GP provision (-367m<sup>2</sup>). This is not forecast to change by 2026.

**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 focusing development in the Rest of HMA areas without promoting services alongside could lead to more isolation.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
Amesbury	CH-A proposes higher levels of growth than current WCS. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the town. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise. The new community proposed at Porton/Boscombe Down may be in close proximity to Amesbury and may also benefit the town. It would also include 8ha employment but may not be delivered until later in the plan period. At this stage, these effects are uncertain. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
Salisbury	This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is lower than current WCS requirement but includes 8ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on	Strategy SA-B focuses on Salisbury and proposes a higher level of growth than current WCS requirement and 10ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is	This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is lower than current WCS requirement and includes 3.5ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently	This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is much lower than current WCS requirement and only includes 2ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in



	<p>health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have significant benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Because this strategy proposes a lower level of growth than all other strategies, only minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>This growth proposed at Tidworth and Ludgershall is comparatively high compared to other strategies but below current WCS requirement. Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities. New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement. Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities. New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement. Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities. New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement. Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities. New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a substantial new community in the Boscombe Down/Porton area. This could benefit both the surrounding rural area and Amesbury as the nearest town through significant provision of affordable housing, new infrastructure, public transport networks, employment and public open space. Whilst this may cause short-term disruption to nearby communities, the longer-term benefits are likely to be significant. Overall, moderate</p>

				positive effects are likely towards the back end of the plan period.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure. However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.	This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA – the same as SA-A. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure. However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.	This strategy proposes relative and comparatively high levels of growth in the Rest of the HMA. Compared to the other strategies, this is considered likely to have moderate positive effects on this objective.	This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA – similar to SA-A and SA-B. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure. However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.25 minor positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.2 minor positive</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- New development in different parts of the HMA is considered to be positive overall, through provision of affordable housing and new or expanded health, education, cultural and recreational 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.
- New development can cause pressure on existing services and facilities in the short-term and needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of new residents. This is especially the case regarding transport, healthcare and education where services are under pressure across much of the area.
- All of the strategies scored similarly in the assessment, however strategies **SA-A and SA-C are marginally more sustainable** as there is more likelihood of benefits.
- **Strategy SA-D has marginally less benefits and is considered the least sustainable option.**
- Strategies that distribute higher levels of growth to different areas e.g. SA-A re Amesbury, SA-A to SA-C re Salisbury, SA-D re New Community and SA-C re Rest of HMA are likely to have greater benefits. However, these levels of higher growth are distributed between all of the strategies which is why they score so similarly.
- For new development to be effective in reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities, it will be very important that all new housing development includes a range of house types/tenures and a level of affordable housing that will actually help reduce the affordability ratio, which is high in this area, and that all new development provides the essential services and facilities that are needed to avoid increasing pressure on existing services and also reduces the need to travel and reduces out-commuting.

**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 this HMA are not universal with the main rail option being present in Salisbury. 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

Amesbury's highway infrastructure is characterised by the A303 running just to the north of the settlement. This strategic link can suffer from peak time delays which cause rat running, impacting the capacity of Amesbury's transport infrastructure. Further delays also occur on the A345 and London Road.

Salisbury hosts a number of key routes, all passing through or around the centre. These routes, namely the A36, A345 and A30 each suffer from peak time delays at key junctions. This congestion also needs to be considered against its impact on the AQMA present within Salisbury.

The A338 is the primary route running through Tidworth and Ludgershall and therefore, with links to the A303, experiences a high volume of HGV traffic. This primary route does have some pinch points further afield which may need to be considered when planning growth, as will the congestion that occurs on this route at peak times.

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 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 Amesbury is primarily focussed on the A303 running just north of the settlement providing direct links to settlements further afield, including key locations beyond Wiltshire. The A345 offers links to the north and south of the settlement. These highway links provide the basis for bus services to serve the settlement with links to a number of locations within Wiltshire and beyond. Rail provision is not present within Amesbury with the nearest station at Grately (limited services) and Salisbury.

Salisbury offers a host of key highway links including the A345, A30 and A36 which forms a ring road around the centre, taking traffic away from this area. Bus services operate to link the suburbs to the centre while park and ride services operate in numerous locations. Other bus routes link Salisbury to several settlements within Wiltshire. Rail provision is strong with the railway station offering a wide variety of direct services.

Tidworth and Ludgershall's main highway link lies with the A338 travelling north/south through the area with the A303 being accessible via this route to the south while the A342 also offers transport options. Bus services utilise these routes to offer public transport provision which is reported to be comparatively well utilised with a relatively high percentage of people of people in the CA travelling to work by bus when compared to the Wiltshire average. Rail provision is not present within the area with the nearest option being Andover 7 miles away.

The often 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.

Amesbury does not benefit from a direct rail link within the town and therefore future enhancements in public transport provision are likely to come from enhanced bus service provision. The highway infrastructure present within the town, namely its links to the A303 and the A345 running north/south offer this opportunity to build on the already present bus services in the town. In safe active travel terms, National Cycle Route 45 passes through the town while the Amesbury town cycle network plan provides further information on opportunities to enhance provision, no off road cycle route is currently present to link Amesbury to Salisbury.

Salisbury offers already strong provision in sustainable transport terms with bus services operating to surrounding settlements and also to link the suburbs to the centre, park and ride provision also offers opportunity to avoid private car usage within the centre. The railway station equally offers strong opportunity to travel by rail to a number of key locations which can be further utilised to offer public transport alternatives to the private car. In safe active travel terms, a high percentage of journeys to work are by foot in the community area compared to the Wiltshire average with community support appearing to outline a desire to further improve pedestrian facilities within the city. In cycling terms, the Wiltshire cycleway and Salisbury and New Forest routes pass through while National Cycle Network 24 and 45 pass through the area which may offer opportunities. Salisbury town cycle network plan is present highlighting provision and opportunities.

The A338 running north/south through the area offers the main transport link to try to further build on the public transport services that are already present within Tidworth and Ludgershall. In this area, further enhancements in the public transport service will mainly be in the bus sector given there is no rail provision present, the nearest being Andover. Walking and cycling as active modes of travel occupy a high modal share in this community area in terms of travel to work option, likely due to the high military presence with soldiers living and working in short distance of each other. Further development of this type may further develop active travel as a preferred mode of transport for which development should facilitate. A town cycle network plan has been developed to highlight opportunities.

Within the rest of the housing market area 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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
Amesbury	Strategy SA-A outlines a relatively higher housing growth for Amesbury. Currently this is assessed as having a minor adverse effect given the extent to which growth will impact existing congestion associated with the town's links to the A303, along with other routes, and what mitigation may be put in place remains unclear at this stage.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.

	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	Strategy SA-D focuses housing growth on the development of a new community at Boscombe/Porton. Given its demographic location this is assessed in combination with its potential impact on Amesbury at this early stage. The location itself is likely to be spatially located near the A303. This may help provide a link to support travel options including bus services, though the viability and impact of such a link will need to be investigated. The location of the A303 can equally cause transport related congestion and rat running, with Amesbury suffering with these problems. The potential impact of a new settlement on these existing concerns must be taken into consideration. Rail provision is currently provided at the nearby Grately station (with limited services) and Salisbury, however, a new community may include a new rail station which would help to promote sustainable travel, though at this stage the viability of such a project remains unknown. Currently, given

				the uncertainty of mitigation and possible impacts, this level of development at this location is assessed as having moderate adverse effects against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	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 strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	A similar level of growth in the rest of HMA is identified in SA-B when comparing it to SA-A. 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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth to other strategies. 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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	A smaller level of housing growth is allocated to the rest of HMA, less than for SA-A. 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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.4 minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective. Both strategies are considered likely to have fewer adverse effects than strategies SA-C and SA-D.
- **Strategy SA-C is the least sustainable option** as it is considered to have greater adverse effects overall.
- Transport issues within the Salisbury 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 within, or near, each settlement. This congestion 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.
- Salisbury has been identified for varying levels of growth across the strategies. For all strategies, significant adverse effects are identified at Salisbury because of existing issues with peak time congestion on the strategic road network through Salisbury, and the possibility that additional growth will exacerbate this. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed to mitigate the effects of proposals in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP) and it is likely that this will need to be looked at again in order to establish further mitigation measures.
- Proposals for Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall are not considered likely to have significant effects.
- The accurate assessment of the option to build a new community is difficult at this stage given the uncertainty surrounding the option. The exact location, subsequent highway infrastructure, possible mitigation and the likelihood of sustainable travel are all unknown at this stage. While it is acknowledged this offers an opportunity to integrate both sustainable transport services and a strong active travel environment within the new community, further assessment of this will only be possible at a future stage. The current significance of effect that has been assessed against this option at this stage is reflective of the potential for negative impacts upon the highway network in this broad location, with mitigation against impacts, and the exact extent of these impacts, currently unknown.

- Growth in the Rest of the HMA, with higher levels in strategy SA-C, places development away from established sustainable transport provision. At this stage, development in these locations has been assessed negatively against this objective (significantly so at higher levels) mainly due to the likelihood that it will not make efficient use of existing sustainable transport infrastructure and may increase private car usage. However, further work establishing the level of development required in certain locations to facilitate investment and improvements in sustainable transport options may change this assessment and clarify the sustainability of the rest of HMA, hence the uncertainty being placed against the assessments at this stage
- Mixed-use development proposals are recommended as this will help increase self-containment and reduce need to travel.
- It is considered key to locate development in places that make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and can facilitate advancements in the use of sustainable transport. Therefore, 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.

#### **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 Salisbury HMA is 10ha. Due to the extent of existing employment provision, none of the three strategies would be likely to result in major positive or negative effects, as the vast majority is already being met by current employment sites or existing commitments.

At Salisbury total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is an above-average concentration of jobs in Wholesale & Retail, and Finance & Insurance. However, the sector profile is very diverse overall, with Finance & insurance highlighted in the JSF as the most prominent sector. Several larger city centre businesses have no capacity in their current workspace to expand, which is having a knock-on impact on business operations. Investments have included Nicholas & Harris' expansion at Churchfields, and High Post Trading Estate is again fully occupied. DSTL continues to invest at Porton, and Phase One of Porton Science Park is complete with strong occupancy; with further aerospace investment planned for Boscombe Down.

At Wilton total employment has dropped significantly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Real Estate, and 'Other' sectors, although due to the small-scale employment base this should not be given too much emphasis.

At Amesbury the total number of jobs in the town has increased slightly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Professional Services, and Accommodation & Food Services. This reflects potential in life sciences and defence, as indicated in the background documents for the Joint Spatial Framework (JSF) that is being prepared for Swindon and Wiltshire. The 160-acre Solstice Park has been developed rapidly with only a few plots remaining: an indication of buoyant demand for well-connected employment sites with infrastructure in place. Recent developments there include the T J Morris (Home Bargains) Southern Distribution Centre (1 million sq ft), a new HQ facility for The Tintometer, Holiday Inn Stonehenge and a number of food outlets. Wiltshire Council is working with local partners including the MoD and QinetiQ on plans for the future development of Boscombe Down, Amesbury. This development will help to boost the local economy and provide exciting opportunities for major inward investment into the county that will enhance job and career prospects in key employment sectors including aerospace and defence technologies.

At Tidworth total jobs growth has moved slightly upwards since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in the Real Estate, Accommodation & Food, and Public Administration & Defence sectors. The JSF also highlights the economy's reliance on MoD employment. MoD related property investment has been comprehensive, supporting Project Allenby/Connaught and the relocation of up to 4,000 service personnel into the garrison area. The existing units nearby in Ludgershall at Castledown Business Park enjoy strong occupancy.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury. There would, however, be significant additional dwellings allocated. Existing employment commitments should be capable of balancing this housing growth, although there is a risk of stagnation in employment towards the end of the plan period, if appetite for occupancy of the sites is high. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a sufficient supply of employment land, although it could lead to stagnation in employment provision towards the end of the plan period, if there is appetite for occupancy of the sites on offer. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a sufficient supply of employment land, although it could lead to stagnation in employment provision towards the end of the plan period, if there is appetite for occupancy of the sites on offer. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a steady supply of employment land through the plan period. However, this no additional growth scenario could potentially lead to stagnation towards the end of the plan period. However, Amesbury should not be seen in isolation from the new community at Porton/Boscombe Down. This new community could be located in close proximity to Amesbury and therefore may need to be considered in this context. In this scenario a mixed-use development would provide sustainable and balanced growth that would have a direct relationship with Amesbury. Therefore, this strategy is predicted to have moderate positive effects overall for the town.



	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
<b>Salisbury</b>	Under this strategy 8ha additional employment land would be required at Salisbury and an additional 5390 homes would be allocated. There are a number of employment allocations around Salisbury that are yet to be implemented e.g. at Churchfields, which suggests that an additional 8ha may not have a major impact on employment at the city. However, as a principal settlement, Salisbury should be a main focus of employment growth for the wider area and having a range of available land could be attractive to inward investors. Given the existing commitments, it is possible that there would be over-provision of employment land at the city. However, positive effects are likely, and the significant level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.	Under this strategy 10ha additional employment land would be required at Salisbury, 2ha more than SA-A, and an additional 6650 homes would be allocated. The additional 2ha, compared to SA-A, would be likely to balance out the additional dwellings. This means that the overall effect would be broadly the same. Given the existing commitments, it is possible that there would be over-provision of employment land at the city. However, significant positive effects are likely, and 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, major benefits are considered likely from this strategy.	Under strategy SA-C 3.5ha employment land would be provided alongside 5390 additional dwellings at Salisbury. It is considered that this would provide a more reasonable balance of development, given the existing commitments. This however, would depend on the appetite for additional employment land in the area. Consequently, this scenario is predicted to result in moderate positive effects.	Under strategy SA-D 2ha employment land would be provided with much lower additional dwellings at Salisbury. It is considered that this would provide less balanced growth than the other strategies. Salisbury is a principal settlement and additional employment growth should therefore be encouraged. Consequently, this scenario of lower employment and housing growth, is only predicted to result in minor positive effects.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: major positive	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	At Tidworth and Ludgershall 2ha additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, alongside 1555 additional dwellings. The additional employment provision is predicted to be positive and the additional housing will also help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, moderate positive effects are likely.	At Tidworth and Ludgershall no additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, but 1210 dwellings are required. To boost sustainability benefits of this strategy, an element of employment should be included. The additional housing will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, minor positive effects are likely but less than SA-C.	At Tidworth and Ludgershall 0.5ha additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, and 1210 dwellings. Taking into account existing commitments and the additional housing which will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour, minor positive effects are likely.	At Tidworth and Ludgershall no additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, but 1210 dwellings are required. To boost sustainability benefits of this strategy, an element of employment should be included. The additional housing will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, minor positive effects are likely but less than SA-C.
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive

<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The new community at Porton/ Boscombe Down would provide mixed-use development with a significant amount of housing and employment. It could provide sustainable and balanced growth that would also have a direct relationship with Amesbury. Precise location is not known however, this element of the strategy is predicted to have moderate positive effects overall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. The additional housing will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-A would have minor positive effects on this objective.	As for SA-A, no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. The additional housing will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-B will also have minor positive effects on this objective.	Under this strategy 6ha of employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean an increase in the existing provision of employment land to balance the allocation of significant additional homes under this strategy. The employment land is likely to comprise a series of small employment allocations that in themselves would be of a scale that could potentially support the vitality of the rural area. This would depend on suitable locations being identified, where the infrastructure is in place to enable them to be integrated sustainably. The significant additional housing will help to support local businesses, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-C would have moderate positive effects on this objective	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA; this would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. And a lower amount of homes is allocated than SA-A and SA-B. The additional housing, although the lowest of all the strategies, will still help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-D would have minor positive effects on this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.4 minor positive</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Overall, **Strategies SA-A, SA-B and SA-C are the most sustainable strategies** as they are likely to have the highest level of benefits across all areas.
- **Strategy SA-D is the least sustainable option** as it will have fewer benefits across all areas.
- Strategy SA-D contains proposals for a new community at Boscombe Down/Porton and although the exact location is not known, the significant level of employment and housing, together with associated benefits for Amesbury also, is the main reason for the level of benefits. Although, there is a degree of uncertainty given there is no location and it may take a long time to deliver.
- Settlements/areas in these strategies that combine a higher level of both employment and housing are considered likely to give greater benefits against this objective as both elements help to improve self-containment of settlements and encourage vibrant and diversified places.
- Outstanding commitments in the Salisbury HMA are capable of meeting a significant proportion of the need for additional employment land to 2036. Consequently, the differences in the effects of the strategic options for the distribution of the 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 achieving a balance between employment and housing growth.
- Strong transport links and connectivity are key factors for the successful delivery of large-scale employment allocations, as demonstrated by Solstice Park, Amesbury and Hampton Park, Melksham. The capacity of the A303 corridor to accommodate additional employment growth will need to be tested.

**Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)** - Rolling forward the core strategy with employment allocations in Salisbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall.

**Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)** - Amesbury, Tidworth/Ludgershall constrained to reflect current commitments, while Rest of HMA reflects assessed need (i.e. - 11%). The rest is directed to Salisbury (6,650).

**Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)** - housing at Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall reflect current commitments, Salisbury reflects assessed need (i.e. -11%). Remainder focused to rural area.

**Strategy SA – D (Boscombe/Porton New Community)** - Housing at all settlements is constrained to commitments. Recognises employment growth at Boscombe and Porton and directs housing growth to a new community related to this economic potential.

Proposed distribution of housing and employment requirements – Salisbury HMA								
Settlement	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)		Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)		Strategy SA – C (Focus on Rest of the HMA)		Strategy SA – D (Boscombe/Porton New Community)	
	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment
Amesbury	2170	0	1230	0	1230	0	1230	0
Salisbury/Wilton	5390	8	6650	10	5390	3.5	4900	2
Tidworth/Ludgershall	1555	2	1210	0	1210	0.5	1210	0
New Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	2000	8
Rest of HMA	1855	0	1885	0	3145	6	1635	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10975</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10975</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10975</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10975</b>	<b>10</b>

**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?**

**Salisbury/Wilton** - The River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) runs through Wilton from the north and west into Salisbury which acts as a significant European Protected Species (EPS) hotspot for otters, Desmoulin's whorl snail, bats and non-EPS including water vole and Schedule 1 birds. However, development within the catchment of the River Avon SAC will be constrained by the Memorandum of Understanding with Environment Agency and Natural England implemented to prevent negative effects on the SAC due to phosphates. The Porton Down Special Protection Area (SPA) lies 7km to the north east, Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA lies 12km north and the New Forest SPA roughly 10km to the south. Depending on the location of growth, additional housing may lead to increased recreational disturbance upon breeding birds on Salisbury Plain and in the New Forest. Furthermore, Bemerton Heath & Barnard's Folly Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Avon Valley LNR lie within or adjacent to Salisbury. There are numerous County Wildlife Sites (CWS) and Habitats of Primary Importance (HPI) nearby.

**Amesbury** - With regards to statutory designations, the River Avon SAC runs north to south on the west side of Amesbury. Furthermore, part of Salisbury Plain SPA/SSSI lies approximately 2km to the east. There are also a number of non-statutory designations including Boscombe Down Railway Line CWS and several other CWSs associated with the river floodplain to the west. There are also some protected species hotspots, namely for water voles, otters, crayfish and birds associated with the River Avon and Stone Curlew plots on arable land near Amesbury.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** - With regards to statutory designations, the Salisbury Plan SAC/SPA/SSSI lies to the immediate west of Tidworth. Furthermore, allocations at Ludgershall are within the visitor catchment of the Salisbury Plain and therefore pose a risk through recreational pressure particularly when considered in combination without other planned growth and projects such as the Army Basing Programme (ABP).

**Rest of the HMA** - Some areas in the Rest of the HMA are designated SSSIs, SACs, and/or SPAs or contain important habitats including ancient woodland. This includes the Salisbury Plain SPA/SSSI, River Avon SAC and Porton Down SPA.

**At Porton-Boscombe Down**, there is Salisbury Plain SPA/SAC to the north, the River Avon SAC to the west, Porton Down SPA/SAC to the east, and Porton Meadows SSSI in the vicinity. The area also lies in close proximity to the non-statutory designations of Boscombe Down Railway Line LWS, Idmiston Down LWS and Countess Farm Swamp LWS.

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

There are no LGSs (formerly Regional Sites of Geological Importance, or RIGs) in close proximity to the market towns in the Salisbury HMA.

**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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Due to the ecologically sensitive designations in proximity to Amesbury and moderately high levels of housing growth proposed for the settlement, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	SA-B proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-C proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.	SA-D proposes a significantly lower amount of housing compared with SA-A. Amesbury may be better able to accommodate this level given nearby designations. Minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Strategy SA-A proposes a modest level of growth for Salisbury/Wilton with an additional quantum of employment land. Due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.	Under SA-B the highest level of growth is directed at Salisbury/Wilton. Due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.	Growth levels proposed at Salisbury/Wilton in all strategies are considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.	Growth levels proposed at Salisbury/Wilton in all strategies are considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury/Wilton, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>

<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	SA-A proposes higher levels of housing and employment at Tidworth and Ludgershall. Given the proximity of the settlement to Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI and potential for recreational impacts, moderate adverse effects are likely.	Lower level of growth to SA-A. Likely minor adverse effects due to the potential recreational impacts on the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI.	Lower level of growth to SA-A. Likely minor adverse effects due to the potential recreational impacts on the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI.	Lower level of growth to SA-A. Likely minor adverse effects due to the potential recreational impacts on the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	At Porton/Boscombe Down there are a number of statutory designations likely to be in close proximity. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of likely effect on this objective. Further ecological assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. However, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered to reduce any impacts.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it may be possible for development to avoid areas of ecological sensitivity. However, as at this stage no sites have been identified, minor adverse effects on this objective are indicated.	Due to the broad geographical area associated with 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, under SA-C, growth quanta for the rural areas would be significantly higher than the other alternatives. For this reason, moderate adverse effects on this objective are more 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 indicated.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, Strategy **SA-D scores marginally better and is the most sustainable strategy against this objective.**
- Strategy **SA-A is considered the least sustainable option** with significant adverse effects likely in Amesbury, Salisbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall.
- Biodiversity issues in the Salisbury HMA are mainly focused on the Salisbury Plain SPA/SAC and SSSI and the River Avon SAC, which are likely to be a factor in decisions on any future development locations. This is particularly noteworthy in the Salisbury/Wilton area where the highest levels of growth are proposed, being the Principal Settlement – for this reason, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all growth scenarios at Salisbury.

- Adverse impacts are likely in relation to all settlements as there are a considerable number of important ecological designations in the area. The location of any new development sites is not known at this stage and so a more precise likelihood of effects is difficult to predict.
- With regard to further work, a New Forest Visitor Survey will need to be commissioned for development in the visitor catchment distance of the New Forest SPA and the Salisbury Plain Mitigation Strategy should be updated in light of new evidence and changes to projected growth in the visitor catchment of the SPA.
- At the current time, the Environment Agency and Natural England advise that all development within the River Avon catchment should be 'phosphate neutral' for an interim period until 2025. Beyond this time an approach will take account of water company planning, as well as latest Government policy and legislation. This is to guard against a further worsening of the condition of the River Avon SAC. An annex of the Nutrient Management Plan will explain measures to help deliver phosphate neutral development and how they will be delivered.

## **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 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, 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 land surrounding the built-up area of **Salisbury** is classified as Grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land, with some spokes of Grade 4 (poor) extending outwards around the River Bourne, Avon and Nadder. There are also some small patches of Grade 2 to the north west, north east, south east and south.

At **Amesbury**, while the area around the River Avon which runs from north to south on the western side of the settlement is classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, the majority of land within and outside Amesbury is Grade 3 apart from patches of Grade 2 to the north and north east.

While **Tidworth** lies in an area of non-agricultural land, **Ludgershall** is surrounded by mainly Grade 3 agricultural land with the western side being non-agricultural.

Excluding the urban areas, the majority of the **Rest of the HMA** including potentially the area of Porton – Boscombe Down is classified as being Grade 3 agricultural land, with some strips of Grade 2 and Grade 4 land around the rivers. The majority of Grade 2 land lies within the Tisbury Community Area.

### **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?**

With regards to mineral resources, there is a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) covering the east of Wilton and west of Salisbury, and another covering the south east of Salisbury.

There is a Mineral Resource Block extending north from **Amesbury** along the River Avon.

There is a Mineral Resource Block to the south of **Tidworth**.

There are some MSAs, particularly in the Tisbury and the Southern Wiltshire Community Areas, as well as some strips of Minerals Resource Blocks.

<b>Settlement/ Area</b>	<b>Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – D (New Community)</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	This strategy proposes a much higher level of housing growth proportional to the settlement. This strategy will likely require development of more greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to SA-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to SA-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.	This strategy proposes lower levels of housing growth compared to SA-A. This strategy will likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of BMV and MSAs. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. Furthermore, it is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in	In the Porton/Boscombe Down area, whilst the airfield is military land and non-agricultural, the rest of the area would pose a risk of losing BMV land. However, the military site may be



			this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	an area of potential contamination risk. While this presents the opportunity for remediating contaminated land, this could affect the viability and deliverability of the site, were this land to be developed. Overall, as greenfield land and agricultural land could well be required for the development, a minor adverse impact on this objective is deemed likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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 presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects are dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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 equal quantum to the roll forward and would therefore be likely to lead to a similar effect.	This strategy proposes a much higher quantum of growth than the other strategies and is therefore likely to lead to greater effects. Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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. Moderate adverse effects are likely.	Due to the presence of MSAs, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for any moderate/major negative effects is dependent on where growth is located. Furthermore, 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. A lower level of growth is proposed through this strategy and it is therefore likely that a lesser effect would result from this strategy.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with greater adverse effects likely.
- 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 and will potentially lead to the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 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 negative effects will occur in all strategies.
- Uncertainties also exist regarding the potential for negative effects on mineral resources and the potential for contaminating and remediating land.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall, and possibly the Boscombe Down element, present areas which are less constrained in the context of objective 2 due to tracts of military land, therefore implying a lower risk of agricultural land loss.
- As Strategy SA-C focuses a much higher level of development around Rest of HMA, it is likely to result in the diffuse loss of greenfield/BMV land.
- Strategy SA-B, with its' greater focus on Salisbury, is also likely to lead to significant adverse effects at Salisbury. It is known that there is comparatively little scope for re-use of PDL in Salisbury. However, all strategies, given the main focus of growth at the Principal Settlement, are considered likely to have significant effects.

- To achieve better sustainability outcomes against this objective, new development should try to maximise use of PDL and avoid areas of BMV, where possible. And development at higher densities would help to reduce loss of greenfield land.
- The majority of the HMA is Grade 3 land. Therefore, in order to identify which areas are more suitable for development and less likely to lead to adverse effects, further assessment is likely to be needed to distinguish between Grade 3a land and Grade 3b land.

**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?**

**Salisbury/Wilton** is surrounded by several Source Protection Zones. These are a mix of Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 (Total Catchment). These are positioned to the east/north east of Salisbury, beyond Laverstock; to the north of Salisbury, beyond Old Sarum; to the west of Salisbury, north of Wilton; and to the south west of Wilton. There is one Drinking Water Protection Area to the south/south east of Salisbury. Additionally, there is a Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface) to the east of Salisbury and a Drinking Water Safeguarding Area (Groundwater) to the north of Salisbury and to the south west of Wilton.

**Amesbury** is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east. This is a Zone 3 (Total Catchment Zone). Further to the south a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) are apparent.

**Boscombe/Porton** has a Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) to the west and north west. This is to the south east of Amesbury. Further to the south of Amesbury is a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater).

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is subject to large amount of water protection. Tidworth and its surrounds are covered by Source Protection Zones: Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone), Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and Zone 3 (Total Catchment). Additionally, a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) is apparent. Ludgershall and its surrounds are subject to a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Surface Water). This spreads beyond the settlement to the south. Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) is apparent to the east of the settlement.

**Rest of the HMA** - while there are rural areas in the HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Areas, there are also plenty of areas in the countryside where development could occur without posing 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?**

Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in **Salisbury** to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025. This is expected to lead to an extension of the operational site. There is a moderate probability that rolling forward the current strategy would require construction works to accommodate development.

At **Amesbury**, there are currently no plans to invest further into the water network by Wessex Water, as works to increase capacity were undertaken prior to 2015. There is a significant probability that rolling forward the current strategy 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.

Wessex Water have not outlined any plans to invest in the local water network at **Tidworth/Ludgershall**.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
---------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------

<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south east but located at Boscombe Down airfield. This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth at Amesbury. There are currently no plans to invest in the water network in the area so there are uncertainties regarding the water network capacity in this strategy. Minor adverse effects are likely across all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Salisbury is subject to planned future investment in water resources - Wessex Water have stated that they plan to invest in Salisbury to reduce phosphates and provide additional capacity between 2020 and 2025 - so there may be an opportunity to continue improvements to the water network. However, due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This strategy proposes a higher level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. Due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to the lack of investment plans at the settlements as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.

		that there would be moderate adverse effects.	that there would be moderate adverse effects.	
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The main concerns with a new settlement at Boscombe/Porton relate to the potential impacts on the water network capacity. There are currently no plans to invest further into the local water network by Wessex Water at Amesbury, which is the closest settlement positioned near to Boscombe/Porton. However, this strategy proposes high levels of growth that would require new infrastructure. As a result, it is likely there could be moderate adverse effects. This strategy proposes growth in a different location to those which form part of the current strategy and so an increased effect on this area is likely in comparison.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, minor adverse effects are the Rest of the HMA is considered likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect on the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. This strategy proposes the equivalent of SA-A and therefore a similar effect is likely.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a moderate adverse effect in the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. Furthermore, as this strategy proposes the highest level of housing and employment growth in the Rest of the HMA, the risk of negative impacts occurring in the rural areas is greater.	Due to the potential impact on the rural drainage system and water protection zones, a minor adverse effect in the Rest of the HMA is considered likely. This strategy proposes a lower level of growth when compared to SA-A and SA-B and so a lesser effect is likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.6 moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are the most sustainable strategies** against this objective as they will have fewer adverse effects.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- 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 that area. 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.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is the settlement which is considered to be the most constrained with regards to the protection of water resources, as the areas has a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and Wessex Water have not outlined any plans to invest in the local water network at Tidworth/Ludgershall.

- Recent improvements were made at Amesbury to increase capacity of the local water network. In addition to this, there are planned investments by Wessex Water to reduce phosphates and increase capacity of the water network at Salisbury.
- Development at the rural areas 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.

#### 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)?

**Salisbury/Wilton** currently has 3 long standing AQMAs for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide. Air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock.

The most recent assessment of **Amesbury** found that the settlement faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. The settlement continues to be monitored, however.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. Diffusion tubes to monitor were introduced to each town in 2019.

The growth allocated within the **Rest of the HMA** may place development in locations where increases in other pollutants such as noise and light may occur, in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and a lack of public transport provision suggests that development in these areas may lead to an increased number of private car journeys magnifying the likelihood of pollutants from vehicles.

A new community in **Boscombe/Porton** would be likely to place pressure on air quality in the locality and would be placed in a location where there is currently no monitoring being undertaken. It is unclear whether it would lead to an exceedance of nitrogen dioxide in the area at this stage.

##### 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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable.	Amesbury currently faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Minor adverse effects likely.

	Minor adverse effects likely.	Minor adverse effects likely.	Minor adverse effects likely.	
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.	There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing particular air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs apparent in the settlement. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	Boscombe/Porton is not currently subject to any AQMAs, but a new community would impact on local air quality due to increased levels of traffic. New development will also increase local levels of noise and light pollution. Amesbury is the nearest settlement to Boscombe/Porton. As identified above, Amesbury was most recently assessed as facing no air quality issues and no AQMAs have been declared, but the current AQS requires an update. As no specific location is known, minor adverse effects are considered likely at this stage.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth.	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth.	This strategy proposes a much higher level of growth than the other	This strategy proposes a moderate level of growth.

	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.	strategies. Therefore, effects are likely to be significantly greater. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects on objective 4.	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development location, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects on objective 4.
	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse	Likely effects: moderate adverse	Likely effects: minor adverse
Overall HMA score	-1.25 minor adverse	-1.25 minor adverse	-1.5 moderate adverse	-1.2 minor adverse

#### Conclusions/Recommendations:

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective as it will have fewer adverse effects overall.
- **Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- All development strategies lead to additional development and are therefore likely to lead to increased environmental pollution in all locations. However, as development locations are not known, likely effects and potential mitigation measures are difficult to predict.
- All strategies in Salisbury are considered likely to result in significant adverse effects because of the scale of growth and the fact that Salisbury already has considerable pressures on the local transport network and three existing AQMAs. There are no other AQMAs identified within this HMA.
- At Porton/Boscombe Down, there may be opportunities to ensure that effects on this objective are minimised in line with the Wiltshire Air Quality Strategy, particularly in locations where there are no existing AQMAs apparent. However, there is some risk that introducing large scale development here could lead to air quality issues, particularly in the Boscombe/Porton area where there are identified pinch points that are not yet monitored for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide.
- 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 policies that promote development of sustainable transport links, promote housing development in sustainable locations and increasing on site vegetation in order to provide carbon sinks.
- It is recommended that where development takes place, improvements in sustainable transport options should be sought to alleviate air quality concerns.
- Development should consider walking and cycling friendly design that promotes and improves safety for these methods.
- With regards to noise and light 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 will 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 flooding form part of the settlement-level analysis below. The cumulative effect of development was also considered in order to identify those catchments where an increase in flows as a result of development would have the greatest effect 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:

**Salisbury** is at high risk of river flooding and at low risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

**Amesbury** is at low risk of river and groundwater flooding and at moderate risk of surface water flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.	The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water potential. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. Development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury/Wilton are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	Tidworth-Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>



<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The potential for a new settlement presents opportunities to find strategic solutions to constraints. A new settlement in the Boscombe Down/ Porton area could have this advantage as regards flood resilience. There are areas of flood risk associated with the River Bourne that flows to the south and east of Boscombe Down. At this stage, the precautionary approach is required since Amesbury itself has surface water issues. Minor adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are likely.	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are signalled.	Under this strategy substantial growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. However, given this increased level of growth and that many rural settlements are located on rivers and have flood issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Under this strategy moderate growth is directed to Rest of HMA. At this strategic stage it is difficult to predict which lower-order settlements would be most affected by development, and what the flood-risks would therefore be. On this basis minor adverse effects are signalled.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-D is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective as it will have fewer adverse effects overall.

**Strategy SA-C is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.

Whilst all areas across Salisbury HMA demonstrate some areas at risk of flooding, the most constrained location is Salisbury/Wilton. All strategies propose a significant amount of growth at Salisbury and therefore there is a likelihood of significant effects at Salisbury/Wilton.

SA-C proposes a significant increase in growth in the rural part of the HMA and therefore, because many rural settlements are located on rivers and have flood issues, moderate adverse effects are considered likely. However, likely effects will depend on any future location of development.

A new settlement in the broad Porton/Boscombe Down area offers opportunities that could promote flood resilience and could offer strategic solutions to flooding elsewhere.

**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 reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, these will be appraised in more detail at site-specific stage. At this strategic stage in/around the settlements the following is to be noted.

**Salisbury:** Growth in/around Salisbury could notably impact upon heritage assets including Salisbury Cathedral / setting, Old Sarum scheduled monument and the city’s conservation areas and settings. Development in/around nearby Wilton would notably impact upon assets including Wilton House GR1 listed building, Wilton Park registered park & garden, the conservation area and St Mary & Nicholas Church scheduled monument.

**Amesbury:** adverse impacts could result on important heritage features, including the Abbey/setting, and the setting of the World Heritage Site to the town’s west.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall:** Ludgershall has its Castle (scheduled monument) and a historic core conservation area with numerous listed buildings and their respective settings. Tidworth, meanwhile, includes the designed settings of Tidworth House and Tidworth Barracks.

**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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	It is likely that the level of growth proposed would have moderate adverse effects which would be difficult to mitigate. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl’s Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl’s Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl’s Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.	Level of growth is lower in this strategy, but moderate adverse effects are still considered likely. In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl’s Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival. Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind moderate adverse effects are likely at Amesbury.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>

<b>Salisbury</b>	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.	There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury/Wilton which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.	Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The new community would be a significant sized development. Depending on the location, it may be possible to avoid significant effects on heritage assets. However, the Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including WHS. At this current stage, moderate adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.	Development under SA-C is significantly higher than the other strategies. The proposed quantum of development may be difficult to accommodate in the rural area and moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	Development at this scale could avoid significant adverse effects, depending on location. The geographic area of the HMA is large. At this stage, minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.6 moderate adverse</b>
<p><b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, <b>Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies</b> against this objective as they will have fewer adverse effects overall.</p> <p><b>Strategy SA-C is the least sustainable option</b> with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely and an overall moderate adverse effect.</p> <p>Given the number and importance of heritage designations around Salisbury and Amesbury, all of the strategies are considered likely to have moderate adverse effects in those settlements given the scale of growth proposed.</p> <p>Tidworth/Ludgershall is considered less constrained for new development in heritage terms where minor adverse effects are considered likely across all strategies.</p> <p>For a new settlement in the Boscombe Down/Porton area, there would be a number of considerations as to its location, as the Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including the World Heritage Site. At this current stage, without further knowledge of the location of this new settlement, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.</p>				

<p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>Decision-Aiding Question (DAQ) 1: Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance nationally designated landscapes and their settings and locally valued landscapes?</b> Whilst this strategic-level analysis appraises designated and locally-valued assets, local ones will become even more prominent during detailed / site-specific SA. At this stage it is important to note the following at the settlements.</p> <p><b>Salisbury:</b> the settlement, with Wilton, is surrounded by valued landscapes and, to the south-west Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB, meaning that any development locations would need to be selected with diligence.</p> <p><b>Amesbury:</b> adverse impacts could occur against important landscape features, not least amongst which the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) as well as Amesbury Abbey and Park, which lie to the town's immediate west.</p> <p><b>Tidworth/Ludgershall:</b> Ludgershall is set within an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed and sensitive to large-scale development. Northwards lies the North Wessex Downs AONB. To the north and west of Tidworth, meanwhile, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain soon becomes evident and would require consideration.</p> <p><b>DAQ 2: Protect rights of way, public open space and common land?</b> These features will be assessed in greater detail in successive rounds of sustainability appraisal when the analysis becomes more detailed.</p>				
<b>Settlement/ Area</b>	<b>Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – D (New Community)</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	The eastern side of Amesbury has less landscape constraints - there are	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is	Strategies SA-B to SA-D propose a much lower level of growth and it is considered more

	no specific landscape designations. However, other parts of the town are more sensitive and in closer proximity to the WHS and Amesbury Abbey and Park. This strategy proposes a much higher level of growth and moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	considered more likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects. Minor effects are considered likely overall.	considered more likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects. Minor effects are considered likely overall.	likely that this can be accommodated without having significant landscape effects. Minor effects are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	It is likely that a new settlement of this scale in the Porton/Boscombe Down area could have significant landscape impacts. There is the potential to adversely affect the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) and its 'outstanding universal value' through factors that include inter alia light pollution.

				Development on the upper slopes of the chalk landscape would be highly visible. The area south-east of Amesbury occupies and is surrounded by a special landscape area (Salisbury SLA). These factors combine to suggest likely significant adverse effects. However, depending on location, it is considered that landscape-scale mitigation would be feasible, indicating moderate adverse effects for a new community overall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-A growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-B growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-C growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, New Forest National Park and a range of historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. It may be possible to accommodate SA-D growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.75 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.6 moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-B and SA-C score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective with fewer adverse effects likely overall.

**Strategy SA-A is the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely and an overall moderate adverse effect.

It is considered that the level of growth proposed in all strategies for Salisbury is likely to have significant adverse effects. There is potential for significant impacts and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. There are also a number of village conservation areas outside the city that could be harmed.

Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall are considered to be less constrained in landscape terms and could accommodate proposed growth, depending on the location, whilst avoiding significant effects on the World Heritage Site and North Wessex Downs AONB.

Significant adverse effects are considered likely for any new settlement of the size proposed in the Porton/Boscombe Down area with potential for impacts on the World Heritage Site and Special Landscape Area. However, development on this scale could also offer opportunities for landscape-scale mitigation such as Green Infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement. It is suggested that the new settlement location be the subject of further analysis to assess whether it could be sustainably designed without detriment to surrounding landscapes and assets.

**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 housing in **Salisbury and Wilton** has been below planned rates, mainly due to delays in strategic allocations coming forward for development, although they have been exceeding delivery expectation in recent years. 26% of homes built at Salisbury during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 were affordable housing, against a target of 40%. However, delivery of the strategic housing allocation at Laverstock and Ford in the Southern CA increases this to 63%. Only 10% were affordable at Wilton, well below target levels. The house price to earnings ratio is now 11.93 for Wilton and 9.05 for Salisbury.

At **Amesbury** the ratio of house price to earnings is relatively stable and at 9.18 is marginally lower than in 2008. 34.6% of homes delivered at the town during the period 1/4/09 – 31/3/18 were affordable, above minimum target levels.

Housing delivery at **Tidworth and Ludgershall** has been below planned rates but the full housing requirement for the settlements is expected to be delivered by 2026 through existing commitments. House price to earnings has risen in the past 10 years but, at 8.3 remains below the Wiltshire average. Affordable housing delivery has been 21.2% which is well below the minimum target of 30% for the area.

For the **Rest of the HMA** (the rural area) homes have been delivered at or above expected levels with the exception of the Tisbury area which has experienced below planned levels of development. Affordability ratios are, however, higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years.

The updated housing requirement means that growth for the HMA will be lower (by approximately 1,400 homes) than the number of homes allocated for 2006 – 2026 under the WCS. Approximately 75% of this proposed housing requirement for the Salisbury HMA is already committed. However, the residual 2,745 homes are unlikely to 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 SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy A is lower than that in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments this leaves a residual requirement of 941 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 Amesbury.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy B is the same as for Strategies C and D, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period, although the extent that this would happen is uncertain. 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 Amesbury.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy C is the same as for Strategies B and D, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. 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 Amesbury.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under Strategy D is the same as for Strategies B and C, and significantly lower than SA-A. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement for the town under this scenario. However, this scenario does include the provision of a new community of 2,000 dwellings in the Porton/ Boscombe Down area, which could be close to Amesbury. If this is the case it is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Amesbury in the longer term. Due to the lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period. If the new community is located away from Amesbury, effects would be dependent on the types of employment and jobs that will be provided at this location as part of the wider development of the area. For this reason, the effects are predicted as minor positive.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving an additional 489 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This rolls forward a lower level of growth than in the current WCS. It is unclear whether existing commitments would provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.</p>	<p>Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving an additional 1,748 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This is a marginally higher level of growth than in the current WCS. 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 Salisbury/Wilton.</p>	<p>Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton leaving an additional 489 dwellings to be identified to maintain supply to 2036. This is a lower level of growth than in the current WCS, and the same as for Strategy A. It is unclear whether existing commitments would provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Salisbury under this scenario is the lowest of the four strategic options. Existing commitments would deliver the full housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton up to 2036 so there is no residual requirement. Existing commitments would be unlikely to provide a consistent supply up to 2036. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes for Salisbury and Wilton.</p>



<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> The residual requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall would be 345 dwellings which would mean that the rate of house building could drop notably for the latter part of the plan period under this scenario. 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 Tidworth and Ludgershall.	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b> The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy B is the same as for Strategies C and D - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy C is the same as for Strategies B and D - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> The housing requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall under Strategy D is the same as for Strategies B and C - significantly lower than in the current WCS. Taking into account existing commitments there would be no residual requirement under this scenario, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.
<b>New settlement</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b> There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b> This strategy includes the provision of a new community of 2,000 dwellings in the Porton/Boscombe Down area. It is considered that the scale of growth would be likely to have a moderate positive effect on the supply of affordable homes in the HMA in the longer term and could also benefit Amesbury which sees a significant drop in its requirement in this strategy. Due to the lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period.
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b> 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. The residual requirement would be 970 dwellings. 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.	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b> Under Strategy B the housing requirements for 2016 – 2036, to be met at small and large villages, would be similar to that in the current WCS (the same as Strategy A). The residual requirement would be 997 dwellings. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas is however limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b> Under Strategy C the housing requirement would be significantly higher than the other strategies, to be delivered at small and large villages in the HMA. This is approximately 1,000 more than allocated in the WCS for the current plan period. The residual requirement would be 2,256 dwellings. The opportunity for the delivery of affordable housing in	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b> The housing requirements for 2016 – 2036 under this strategy would mean a housing requirement to be met at small and large villages lower than that in the current WCS. The residual requirement would be 745 dwellings. 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 are likely to result in

	These factors on balance are likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance are likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	rural areas is limited by appropriate site size but this significant increase is likely to be positive overall against this objective	a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>0 neutral effect</b>	<b>-0.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-0.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>0 neutral effect</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-D score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective. Both strategies are likely to have a neutral effect on this objective.

**Strategies SA-B and SA-C score equally and are considered the least sustainable strategies.** Both strategies are likely to have a minor adverse effect on this objective.

None of the strategies under consideration are likely to be positive against this objective. This is because there has been an overall drop in the requirement for the HMA compared with the current plan period. Existing commitments in many cases have led to a zero or small residual requirement which would not provide a consistent supply up to 2036. To increase the benefits for affordable and market housing provision in this HMA, the overall requirement would need to be significantly higher.

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 total number of homes being planned for in each ADS is also the same for each scenario, meaning that the difference in effects between them will not be major.

However, overall the housing requirement for the Salisbury HMA is lower (by approx. 1,400 dwellings) than for the current plan period. Given that the % of affordable homes delivered against the current plan requirement has been below target levels, the housing requirement for this HMA against the next plan period is therefore unlikely to address any shortfall in provision of affordable homes. This is primarily because existing commitments are likely to be built out before the end of the plan period, potentially creating a slowdown in housing construction (and provision of affordable homes) in the HMA during the latter half of 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?**

**Salisbury/Wilton** are subject to areas of high deprivation, with 13% of the population living in areas with high deprivation scores. It is the only settlement in the Salisbury HMA that is subject to an area of deprivation.

Older people in **Salisbury/Wilton, Tidworth/Ludgershall** and **Amesbury** are more at risk of social isolation than Wiltshire as a whole.

A higher proportion than the Wiltshire average of younger people within **Salisbury/Wilton** and **Tidworth/Ludgershall** are living within low income families and/or are being supported by the Common Assessment Framework (CAF).

Additionally, a higher than Wiltshire average proportion of 0-25 year olds in **Tidworth/Ludgershall** are supported by social care.

In the **Rest of the HMA**, a higher proportion than the Wiltshire average of children in Downton and Whiteparish are currently supported by CAF.

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

**Amesbury** is served by a health care centre, which is currently experiencing a gap (-88m<sup>2</sup>) in provision. This gap is expected to increase to -213m<sup>2</sup> by 2026 and development commitments are expected to put pressure on existing services. Stonehenge School and Avon Valley College are currently undergoing expansion to meet known demand for school places in the area. Substantial levels of development (around 7000 new homes) would be able to support a new secondary school in the area. The needs of up to 1000 homes could be accommodated at Avon Valley College and additional expansion could be an opportunity.

Current educational facilities are under pressure and the expansion of Stonehenge School is underway to meet existing known demand. A new local primary school is due to open and additional opportunities for expansion are available, but growth upwards of 350 new homes would require new provision.

At **Salisbury/Wilton** there is capacity identified across the secondary schools and some surplus capacity among primary schools. A new primary school has been secured, in addition, in supply of places forecast from 2024 onwards as planned expansion will meet known demand. Health centres are located within both Salisbury and Wilton, providing a range of services. Substantial levels of growth would require the provision of new facilities, but identifying suitable land may be difficult. The healthcare centre in Salisbury is currently subject to a shortfall in provision (-227m<sup>2</sup>). This gap is expected remedied by the redevelopment of Salisbury City surgery. An additional surgery could come forward at Old Sarum.

Wellington Academy, which serves **Tidworth/Ludgershall** is currently being expanded to meet the needs of demand of army basing and new civilian housing in the area. However, further expansion to meet emerging known demand is expected to be needed by 2023. There is a risk that school could become very large. Higher levels of growth (around 4500 new homes) are more likely to be able to support new provision. New primary provision is currently being built and there is scope for a small amount of expansion at Clarendon Infant and Junior School. Beyond this, there is limited opportunity to expand existing primary provision. As a result, modest growth could be accommodated in existing provision, but higher levels of growth would require new primary provision. There are currently no issues considered, but this is expected to change in the near future as a result of army rebasing.

In the **Rest of the HMA**, Downton and Whiteparish are currently subject to a gap in GP provision (-367m<sup>2</sup>). This is not forecast to change by 2026.

**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 focusing development in the Rest of HMA areas without promoting services alongside could lead to more isolation.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	CH-A proposes higher levels of growth than current WCS. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the town. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded facilities, and creation of new areas of public open	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded facilities, and creation of new areas of public open	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same lower level of housing growth and no employment. This is unlikely to place significant pressure on existing services and facilities and should have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.

	<p>new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>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. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>The new community proposed at Porton/Boscombe Down may be in close proximity to Amesbury and may also benefit the town. It would also include 8ha employment but may not be delivered until later in the plan period. At this stage, these effects are uncertain. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is lower than current WCS requirement but includes 8ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>Strategy SA-B focuses on Salisbury and proposes a higher level of growth than current WCS requirement and 10ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have significant benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is lower than current WCS requirement and includes 3.5ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Overall, moderate positive effects are considered likely.</p>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury/ Wilton is much lower than current WCS requirement and only includes 2ha employment. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it should also have benefits in terms of provision of affordable housing and new or expanded 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. Because this strategy proposes a lower level of growth than all other strategies, only minor positive effects are considered likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>This growth proposed at Tidworth and Ludgershall is comparatively high compared to other strategies but below current WCS requirement.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement.</p>	<p>The levels of growth in SA-B to SA-D are very similar and significantly lower than current WCS requirement.</p>

	<p>Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>Development is likely to be positive overall although may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. Minor positive effects are likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a substantial new community in the Boscombe Down/Porton area.</p> <p>This could benefit both the surrounding rural area and Amesbury as the nearest town through significant provision of affordable housing, new infrastructure, public transport networks, employment and public open space. Whilst this may cause short-term disruption to nearby communities, the longer-term benefits are likely to be significant.</p> <p>Overall, moderate positive effects are likely towards the back end of the plan period.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	<p>This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA.</p> <p>Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA – the same as SA-A.</p> <p>Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes relative and comparatively high levels of growth in the Rest of the HMA.</p> <p>Compared to the other strategies, this is considered likely to have moderate positive effects on this objective.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a modest level of growth for the Rest of the HMA – similar to SA-A and SA-B.</p> <p>Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services, and new development could increase pressure if not accompanied by adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>However, new development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.</p>

	Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.	Overall, minor positive effects are likely without knowing specific locations for new development.		
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.25 minor positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.2 minor positive</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

New development in different parts of the HMA is considered to be positive overall, through provision of affordable housing and new or expanded health, education, cultural and recreational 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.

New development can cause pressure on existing services and facilities in the short-term and needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of new residents. This is especially the case regarding transport, healthcare and education where services are under pressure across much of the area.

All of the strategies scored similarly in the assessment, however strategies **SA-A and SA-C are marginally more sustainable** as there is more likelihood of benefits.

**Strategy SA-D has marginally less benefits and is considered the least sustainable option.**

Strategies that distribute higher levels of growth to different areas e.g. SA-A re Amesbury, SA-A to SA-C re Salisbury, SA-D re New Community and SA-C re Rest of HMA are likely to have greater benefits. However, these levels of higher growth are distributed between all of the strategies which is why they score so similarly.

For new development to be effective in reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities, it will be very important that all new housing development includes a range of house types/tenures and a level of affordable housing that will actually help reduce the affordability ratio, which is high in this area, and that all new development provides the essential services and facilities that are needed to avoid increasing pressure on existing services and also reduces the need to travel and reduces out-commuting.

**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 this HMA are not universal with the main rail option being present in Salisbury. 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.

1.

**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.

**Amesbury's** highway infrastructure is characterised by the A303 running just to the north of the settlement. This strategic link can suffer from peak time delays which cause rat running, impacting the capacity of Amesbury's transport infrastructure. Further delays also occur on the A345 and London Road.

**Salisbury** hosts a number of key routes, all passing through or around the centre. These routes, namely the A36, A345 and A30 each suffer from peak time delays at key junctions. This congestion also needs to be considered against its impact on the AQMA present within Salisbury.

The A338 is the primary route running through **Tidworth and Ludgershall** and therefore, with links to the A303, experiences a high volume of HGV traffic. This primary route does have some pinch points further afield which may need to be considered when planning growth, as will the congestion that occurs on this route at peak times.

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.

2.

#### **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 **Amesbury** is primarily focussed on the A303 running just north of the settlement providing direct links to settlements further afield, including key locations beyond Wiltshire. The A345 offers links to the north and south of the settlement. These highway links provide the basis for bus services to serve the settlement with links to a number of locations within Wiltshire and beyond. Rail provision is not present within Amesbury with the nearest station at Grately (limited services) and Salisbury.

**Salisbury** offers a host of key highway links including the A345, A30 and A36 which forms a ring road around the centre, taking traffic away from this area. Bus services operate to link the suburbs to the centre while park and ride services operate in numerous locations. Other bus routes link Salisbury to several settlements within Wiltshire. Rail provision is strong with the railway station offering a wide variety of direct services.

**Tidworth and Ludgershall's** main highway link lies with the A338 travelling north/south through the area with the A303 being accessible via this route to the south while the A342 also offers transport options. Bus services utilise these routes to offer public transport provision which is reported to be comparatively well utilised with a relatively high percentage of people of people in the CA travelling to work by bus when compared to the Wiltshire average. Rail provision is not present within the area with the nearest option being Andover 7 miles away.

The often 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 infrequent 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.

**Amesbury** does not benefit from a direct rail link within the town and therefore future enhancements in public transport provision are likely to come from enhanced bus service provision. The highway infrastructure present within the town, namely its links to the A303 and the A345 running north/south offer this opportunity to build on the already present bus services in the town. In safe active travel terms, National Cycle Route 45 passes through the town while the Amesbury town cycle network plan provides further information on opportunities to enhance provision, no off-road cycle route is currently present to link Amesbury to Salisbury.

**Salisbury** offers already strong provision in sustainable transport terms with bus services operating to surrounding settlements and also to link the suburbs to the centre, park and ride provision also offers opportunity to avoid private car usage within the centre. The railway station equally offers strong opportunity to travel by rail to a number of key locations which can be further utilised to offer public transport alternatives to the private car. In safe active travel terms, a high percentage of journeys to work are by foot in the community area compared to the Wiltshire average with community support appearing to outline a desire to further improve pedestrian facilities within the city. In cycling terms, the Wiltshire cycleway and Salisbury and New Forest routes pass through while National Cycle Network 24 and 45 pass through the area which may offer opportunities. Salisbury town cycle network plan is present highlighting provision and opportunities.

The A338 running north/south through the area offers the main transport link to try to further build on the public transport services that are already present within **Tidworth and Ludgershall**. In this area, further enhancements in the public transport service will mainly be in the bus sector given there is no rail provision present, the nearest being Andover. Walking and cycling as active modes of travel occupy a high modal share in this community area in terms of travel to work option, likely due to the high military presence with soldiers living and working in short distance of each other. Further development of this type may further develop active travel as a preferred mode of transport for which development should facilitate. A town cycle network plan has been developed to highlight opportunities.

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 infrequent, 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.

<b>Settlement/ Area</b>	<b>Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)</b>	<b>Strategy SA – D (New Community)</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Strategy SA-A outlines a relatively higher housing growth for Amesbury. Currently this is assessed as having a minor adverse effect given the extent to which growth will impact existing congestion associated with the town's links to the A303, along with other routes, and what mitigation may be put in place remains unclear at this stage.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.	SA-B to SA-D all propose the same, lower level of growth. This is also considered likely to have minor adverse effects on the town's transport infrastructure.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again	All strategies propose a level of growth to Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts.



	mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects are likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects are likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects are likely.	SA-A proposes a slightly higher level of growth to the other strategies but still below WCS requirement. Significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	Strategy SA-D focuses housing growth on the development of a new community at Boscombe/Porton. Given its demographic location this is assessed in combination with its potential impact on Amesbury at this early stage. The location itself is likely to be spatially located near the A303. This may help provide a link to support travel options including bus services, though the viability and impact of such a link will need to be investigated. The location of the A303 can equally cause transport related congestion and rat running, with Amesbury suffering with these problems. The potential impact of a new settlement on these existing concerns must be taken into consideration. Rail provision is currently provided at the nearby Grately station (with limited services) and Salisbury, however, a new community may include a new rail station which would help to promote sustainable travel, though at this stage the viability of such a project remains unknown. Currently, given the uncertainty of mitigation and possible impacts, this level of development at this location is assessed as having moderate adverse effects against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	A continuation of the current levels of growth in the rest of HMA may place growth in locations with reduced	A similar level of growth in the rest of HMA is identified in SA-B when comparing it to SA-A. When	This strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth to other strategies.	A smaller level of housing growth is allocated to the rest of HMA, less than for SA-A. When considering the rest HMA it is acknowledged

	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 strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.	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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a moderate adverse effect against this objective.	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 transport provision and accessibility. Given the extent to which this is possible remains unclear at this stage. This strategy is assessed as having a minor adverse effect against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.25 minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.4 minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-A and SA-B score equally and are considered the most sustainable strategies** against this objective. Both strategies are considered likely to have fewer adverse effects than strategies SA-C and SA-D.

**Strategy SA-C is the least sustainable option** as it is considered to have greater adverse effects overall.

Transport issues within the Salisbury 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 within, or near, each settlement. This congestion 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.

Salisbury has been identified for varying levels of growth across the strategies. For all strategies, significant adverse effects are identified at Salisbury because of existing issues with peak time congestion on the strategic road network through Salisbury, and the possibility that additional growth will exacerbate this. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed to mitigate the effects of proposals in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP) and it is likely that this will need to be looked at again in order to establish further mitigation measures.

Proposals for Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall are not considered likely to have significant effects.

The accurate assessment of the option to build a new community is difficult at this stage given the uncertainty surrounding the option. The exact location, subsequent highway infrastructure, possible mitigation and the likelihood of sustainable travel are all unknown at this stage. While it is acknowledged this offers an opportunity to integrate both sustainable transport services and a strong active travel environment within the new community, further assessment of this will only be possible at a future stage. The current significance of effect that has been assessed against this option at this stage is reflective of the potential for negative impacts upon the highway network in this broad location, with mitigation against impacts, and the exact extent of these impacts, currently unknown.

Growth in the Rest of the HMA, with higher levels in strategy SA-C, places development away from established sustainable transport provision. At this stage, development in these locations has been assessed negatively against this objective (significantly so at higher levels) mainly due to the likelihood that it will not make efficient use of existing sustainable transport infrastructure and may increase private car usage. However, further work establishing the level of development required in certain locations to facilitate investment and improvements in sustainable transport options may change this assessment and clarify the sustainability of the rest of HMA, hence the uncertainty being placed against the assessments at this stage.

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

It is considered key to locate development in places that make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and can facilitate advancements in the use of sustainable transport. Therefore, 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.

### **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 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 Salisbury HMA is 10ha. Due to the extent of existing employment provision, none of the strategies would be likely to result in major positive or negative effects, as the vast majority is already being met by current employment sites or existing commitments.

At **Salisbury** total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is an above-average concentration of jobs in Wholesale & Retail, and Finance & Insurance. However, the sector profile is very diverse overall, with Finance & insurance highlighted in the JSF as the most prominent sector. Several larger city centre businesses have no capacity in their current workspace to expand, which is having a knock-on impact on business operations. Investments have included Nicholas & Harris' expansion at Churchfields, and High Post Trading Estate is again fully occupied. DSTL continues to invest at Porton, and Phase One of Porton Science Park is complete with strong occupancy; with further aerospace investment planned for Boscombe Down.

At **Wilton** total employment has dropped significantly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Real Estate, and 'Other' sectors, although due to the small-scale employment base this should not be given too much emphasis.

At **Amesbury** the total number of jobs in the town has increased slightly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Professional Services, and Accommodation & Food Services. This reflects potential in life sciences and defence, as indicated in the background documents for the Joint Spatial Framework (JSF) that is being prepared for Swindon and Wiltshire. The 160-acre Solstice Park has been developed rapidly with only a few plots remaining: an indication of buoyant demand for well-connected employment sites with infrastructure in place. Recent developments there include the T J Morris (Home Bargains) Southern Distribution Centre (1 million sq ft), a new HQ facility for The Tintometer, Holiday Inn Stonehenge and a number of food outlets. Wiltshire Council is working with local partners including the MoD and QinetiQ on plans for the future development of Boscombe Down, Amesbury. This development will help to boost the local economy and provide exciting opportunities for major inward investment into the county that will enhance job and career prospects in key employment sectors including aerospace and defence technologies.

At **Tidworth** total jobs growth has moved slightly upwards since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in the Real Estate, Accommodation & Food, and Public Administration & Defence sectors. The JSF also highlights the economy's reliance on MoD employment. MoD related property investment has been comprehensive, supporting Project Allenby/Connaught and the relocation of up to 4,000 service personnel into the garrison area. The existing units nearby in **Ludgershall** at Castledown Business Park enjoy strong occupancy.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – A (Current Strategy)	Strategy SA – B (Salisbury Focus)	Strategy SA – C (Focus on the Rest of the HMA)	Strategy SA – D (New Community)
<b>Amesbury</b>	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury. There would, however, be significant additional dwellings allocated. Existing employment commitments should be capable of balancing this housing growth, although there is a risk of stagnation in employment towards the end of the plan period, if appetite for occupancy of the sites is high. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a sufficient supply of employment land, although it could lead to stagnation in employment provision towards the end of the plan period, if there is appetite for occupancy of the sites on offer. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a sufficient supply of employment land, although it could lead to stagnation in employment provision towards the end of the plan period, if there is appetite for occupancy of the sites on offer. 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 employment provision was included in the strategy.	Under this strategy no additional employment land would be allocated at Amesbury and there is a lower provision for housing. Existing commitments at Amesbury could potentially provide a steady supply of employment land through the plan period. However, this no additional growth scenario could potentially lead to stagnation towards the end of the plan period. However, Amesbury should not be seen in isolation from the new community at Porton/Boscombe Down. This new community could be located in close proximity to Amesbury and therefore may need to be considered in this context. In this scenario a mixed-use development would provide sustainable and balanced growth that would have a direct relationship with Amesbury. Therefore, this strategy is predicted to have moderate positive effects overall for the town.

	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: moderate positive
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>Under this strategy 8ha additional employment land would be required at Salisbury and an additional 5390 homes would be allocated. There are a number of employment allocations around Salisbury that are yet to be implemented e.g. at Churchfields, which suggests that an additional 8ha may not have a major impact on employment at the city. However, as a principal settlement, Salisbury should be a main focus of employment growth for the wider area and having a range of available land could be attractive to inward investors.</p> <p>Given the existing commitments, it is possible that there would be over-provision of employment land at the city. However, positive effects are likely, and the significant level of housing proposed will also help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour.</p>	<p>Under this strategy 10ha additional employment land would be required at Salisbury, 2ha more than SA-A, and an additional 6650 homes would be allocated. The additional 2ha, compared to SA-A, would be likely to balance out the additional dwellings. This means that the overall effect would be broadly the same. Given the existing commitments, it is possible that there would be over-provision of employment land at the city. However, significant positive effects are likely, and 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, major benefits are considered likely from this strategy.</p>	<p>Under strategy SA-C 3.5ha employment land would be provided alongside 5390 additional dwellings at Salisbury. It is considered that this would provide a more reasonable balance of development, given the existing commitments. This however, would depend on the appetite for additional employment land in the area. Consequently, this scenario is predicted to result in moderate positive effects.</p>	<p>Under strategy SA-D 2ha employment land would be provided with much lower additional dwellings at Salisbury. It is considered that this would provide less balanced growth than the other strategies. Salisbury is a principal settlement and additional employment growth should therefore be encouraged. Consequently, this scenario of lower employment and housing growth, is only predicted to result in minor positive effects.</p>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>Likely effects: moderate positive</p> <p>At Tidworth and Ludgershall 2ha additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, alongside 1555 additional dwellings. The additional employment provision is predicted to be positive and the additional housing will also help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, moderate positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>Likely effects: major positive</p> <p>At Tidworth and Ludgershall no additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, but 1210 dwellings are required. To boost sustainability benefits of this strategy, an element of employment should be included. The additional housing will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, minor positive effects are likely but less than SA-C.</p>	<p>Likely effects: moderate positive</p> <p>At Tidworth and Ludgershall 0.5ha additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, and 1210 dwellings. Taking into account existing commitments and the additional housing which will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour, minor positive effects are likely.</p>	<p>Likely effects: minor positive</p> <p>At Tidworth and Ludgershall no additional employment land would be provided under this strategy, but 1210 dwellings are required. To boost sustainability benefits of this strategy, an element of employment should be included. The additional housing will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Overall, minor positive effects are likely but less than SA-C.</p>
	Likely effects: moderate positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive	Likely effects: minor positive

<b>New settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The new community at Porton/ Boscombe Down would provide mixed-use development with a significant amount of housing and employment. It could provide sustainable and balanced growth that would also have a direct relationship with Amesbury. Precise location is not known however, this element of the strategy is predicted to have moderate positive effects overall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. The additional housing will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-A would have minor positive effects on this objective.	As for SA-A, no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. The additional housing will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-B will also have minor positive effects on this objective.	Under this strategy 6ha of employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA. This would mean an increase in the existing provision of employment land to balance the allocation of significant additional homes under this strategy. The employment land is likely to comprise a series of small employment allocations that in themselves would be of a scale that could potentially support the vitality of the rural area. This would depend on suitable locations being identified, where the infrastructure is in place to enable them to be integrated sustainably. The significant additional housing will help to support local businesses, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-C would have moderate positive effects on this objective	Under this strategy no employment land would be allocated for the rest of the HMA; this would mean a continuation of the existing approach to the provision of employment land to meet local needs. And a lower amount of homes is allocated than SA-A and SA-B. The additional housing, although the lowest of all the strategies, will still help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-D would have minor positive effects on this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall HMA score</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.5 moderate positive</b>	<b>1.4 minor positive</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Overall, **Strategies SA-A, SA-B and SA-C are the most sustainable strategies** as they are likely to have the greatest number of benefits across all areas.

**Strategy SA-D is the least sustainable option** as it will have fewer benefits across all areas.

Strategy SA-D contains proposals for a new community at Boscombe Down/Porton and although the exact location is not known, the significant level of employment and housing, together with associated benefits for Amesbury also, is the main reason for the level of benefits. Although, there is a degree of uncertainty given there is no location and it may take a long time to deliver.

Settlements/areas in these strategies that combine a higher level of both employment and housing are considered likely to give greater benefits against this objective as both elements help to improve self-containment of settlements and encourage vibrant and diversified places.

Outstanding commitments in the Salisbury HMA are capable of meeting a significant proportion of the need for additional employment land to 2036. Consequently, the differences in the effects of the strategic options for the distribution of the 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 achieving a balance between employment and housing growth.

Strong transport links and connectivity are key factors for the successful delivery of large-scale employment allocations, as demonstrated by Solstice Park, Amesbury and Hampton Park, Melksham. The capacity of the A303 corridor to accommodate additional employment growth will need to be tested.

**SA Annex 1.2 - Salisbury Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18)**

Settlement/area	Emerging Spatial Strategy	
	Housing	Employment (ha)
Amesbury	1635	0

Salisbury / Wilton <sup>1</sup>	5240	5
	400	0
Tidworth/Ludgershall	1555	5
New Community <sup>2</sup>	0	0
Rest of HMA	2140	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10970</b>	<b>10</b>

**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
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, given proximity to statutory designations, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.75 moderate adverse effect</b>	

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this assessment, Salisbury and Wilton have been assessed together as they were for the assessment of LHNA and Standard Method strategies. This is so that a direct comparison can be made between the Emerging Spatial strategy assessment and previous assessments.

<sup>2</sup> 'New Community' has been included even though no housing or employment is proposed as part of a new community. This is because it was included in the previous LHNA and Standard Method strategies that were subject to SA and it allows a direct comparison between assessment scores.



**Conclusions/Recommendations:** Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Amesbury, Salisbury/Wilton and Tidworth/Ludgershall.

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

Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)

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
Amesbury	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
Salisbury / Wilton	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
Tidworth/ Ludgershall	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
New Community	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
Rest of HMA	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

**Overall score: -1.25 minor adverse effect**

**Conclusions/Recommendations:** Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The area most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Salisbury/Wilton.

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

Decision-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
-----------------	--

<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.75 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury/Wilton, Tidworth/Ludgershall and Rest of HMA.	

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

##### Decision-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?

<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects considered most likely.

	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The area most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Salisbury/Wilton.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)).</b>	
<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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects considered most likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The area most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Salisbury/Wilton.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 6: Protect, maintain and enhance the historic environment</b>	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 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? 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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. It is likely that the level of growth proposed would have significant adverse effects which would be difficult to mitigate. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.5 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Amesbury and Salisbury/Wilton.	

<b>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</b>	
<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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury.

	Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy, given the proximity of important landscape and historical designations on the edge of the town. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.75 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Amesbury, Salisbury/Wilton and Rest of HMA.	

<b>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</b>	
<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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy as taking into account existing commitments, a residual requirement of just 349 dwellings would be required for the plan period. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Salisbury and Wilton. It is unclear whether existing commitments would provide a consistent supply up to 2036. This emerging strategy for 5640 dwellings is less than the current Core Strategy requirement of 6060 dwellings. This strategy is likely to have minor benefits only for Salisbury and Wilton overall. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Neutral effects considered most likely. The residual requirement for Tidworth and Ludgershall would be 166 dwellings which would mean that the rate of house building could drop notably for the latter part of the plan period under this scenario.

	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which will increase benefits slightly. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: 0.25 minor positive effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor positive effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. No areas are considered likely to experience significant benefits against this objective.	

**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?

<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy as considering existing commitments, a residual requirement of just 349 dwellings would be required for the plan period. This is unlikely to have significant benefits in terms of reducing poverty and social exclusion.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any benefits are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate benefits are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so benefits are likely to be more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Benefits likely to be minor positive overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any benefits slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>

<b>Overall score: 1.25 minor positive effect</b>
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor positive effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. Only Salisbury/Wilton is considered likely to experience significant benefits against this objective.

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices</b>	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Emerging Spatial Strategy 2016 – 2036 (Reg 18) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury / Wilton</b>	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so adverse effects are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community</b>	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.25 minor adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. The area most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective is Salisbury/Wilton.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 11: Encourage a vibrant and diversified economy and provide for long-term sustainable economic growth</b>	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u> 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
Amesbury	Housing requirement of 1635 is substantially lower than Standard Method Strategy SA-A (2070 dwellings) but substantially higher than LHNA and Standard Method Strategies B, C and D which all allocate 1230 dwellings to Amesbury. The emerging strategy does not allocate any employment land to Amesbury. Refer to previous assessments of those strategies. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely for this emerging strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
Salisbury / Wilton	The emerging strategy has a housing requirement of 5640 dwellings and 5Ha employment land. Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-C, albeit this emerging strategy allocates 250 more dwellings and 1.5Ha more employment land. This will mean that any benefits are likely to be slightly more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-C above. Overall, moderate benefits are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
Tidworth/ Ludgershall	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategy SA-A. However, this emerging strategy would deliver 3Ha more employment land so the benefits are likely to be more significant. Refer to the assessment findings for LHNA Strategy SA-A above. <b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
New Community	N/A <b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
Rest of HMA	Overall beneficial effects considered likely to be similar to Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) Strategies SA-A and SA-B. However, this emerging strategy allocates 285 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any benefits slightly more significant. Refer to those assessment findings above. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall score: 1.5 moderate positive effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate positive effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. Salisbury/Wilton and Tidworth/Ludgershall are considered likely to experience significant benefits against this objective.	

## SA Annex 1.2 - Salisbury Housing Market Area (HMA) - SA of Further Alternative Development Strategies

Strategy SA – E (Dispersal)

Strategy SA – F (Boscombe/Porton new community and Salisbury focus)

Strategy SA – G (High Post New Community and Tidworth/Ludgershall expansion)

Proposed distribution of housing and employment requirements – Salisbury HMA			
Settlement	Strategy SA – E (Dispersal)	Strategy SA – F (Boscombe/Porton new community and Salisbury focus)	Strategy SA – G (High Post New Community and Tidworth/ Ludgershall expansion)



	Housing	Employment (Ha)	Housing	Employment (Ha)	Housing	Employment (Ha)
Amesbury	1425	2.5	630	1	1365	2.5
Salisbury	4400	7.5	4540	8	4375	7.5
Tidworth/Ludgershall	1520	2.5	1140	2	1940	3.5
Wilton	345	1	145	1	145	1
Rest of HMA	2005	13	2090	13	2090	13
High Post New Village	800	1.5	0	0	800	1.5
Boscombe/Porton New Settlement	0	0	2165	4	0	0
Durrington	215	1	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,710</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10,710</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10,715</b>	<b>29</b>

**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?**

**Amesbury** - All new development at Amesbury would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with EA / NE requires development to be phosphorus neutral. This will be difficult to achieve because of the limited offsetting options available at this settlement. The River Avon SAC runs north to south on the west side of Amesbury. The river and its floodplain support high biodiversity including many protected and priority species including water voles, otters, white-clawed crayfish and many species of bats and birds. All parts of any development must be located out of the floodplain to ensure the SAC can achieve its conservation objectives in the long term. Likewise, development must be located / designed to avoid increased recreational pressure along the riverbanks. Amesbury lies within a zone where people visit Salisbury Plain SPA regularly for exercise, putting one of the SPA's features, breeding stone curlew, at risk. The Council has a scheme in place which mitigates impacts on this species and new housing must demonstrate it would not compromise the scheme's effectiveness. There are also a number of non-statutory designations including Boscombe Down Railway Line County Wildlife Site (CWS) and several other CWSs associated with the river floodplain to the west which are vulnerable to recreational pressure if located on public rights of way. The most sensitive priority habitats and species tend to be associated with the river Avon floodplain. Other priority habitats including calcareous grassland, hedgerows and copses are readily retained within developments.

**Salisbury** - All new development at Salisbury would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. This will be difficult to achieve at this settlement depending on the quantum of new development proposed for the main sewage works. However, being at the bottom of the catchment means mitigation can be delivered anywhere upstream. The

river supports protected and priority species as listed for Amesbury and development within 20m of the river can have a significant negative effect on these. Salisbury is beyond the zone of influence for Salisbury Plain SPA but is within the zones of recreational influence for the New Forest protected sites (SPA/SAC and Ramsar site). The Council's mitigation strategy for the New Forest addresses impacts through the creation of new SANGs and provision of access management within the Forest itself. Bemerton Heath & Barnard's Folly Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Avon Valley LNR lie within and adjacent to Salisbury respectively and there are numerous CWSs and extensive areas of priority habitat within and just beyond the city.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** - Tidworth lies within the River Avon catchment (River Bourne sub-catchment) and development here would go to the Tidworth treatment works. There is a high risk that even small additional discharges to this works could not be offset because of the very limited options for offsetting in the Bourne sub-catchment. Ludgershall lies within the River Test catchment and would discharge into Ludgershall treatment works. Development here would need to demonstrate it would be nitrogen neutral in order to have no adverse effect on the Solent Maritime International protected sites. The Council is developing an offsetting scheme for nitrogen and development at Ludgershall is not expected to lead to negative effects. Both Tidworth and Ludgershall lie within the zone of influence for Salisbury Plain SPA and new housing must therefore demonstrate it would not compromise the effectiveness of the Council's stone curlew mitigation scheme.

**Wilton** - All new development at Wilton would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. As Wilton discharges to the WRC at Salisbury, low down in the catchment, mitigation can be delivered anywhere upstream of Salisbury. The rivers Nadder and Wylde and many tributaries run through Wilton providing much habitat for the SAC and SSSI features including fish, otter and water vole. All parts of any development must be located out of the floodplain to ensure the SAC can achieve its conservation objectives in the long term. Likewise, development must be located / designed to avoid increased recreational pressure along the riverbanks. Wilton lies beyond the 13.8km buffer from the New Forest protected sites, although HRA may be triggered for developments larger than 50 dwellings up to 15km away from the Forest. Only Flouse Hole CWS is publicly accessible and could be affected by increased recreational pressure. Similarly, there are extensive areas of the priority habitat lowland wet grassland near Wilton, but public access is very limited. The rivers are likely to be important flight lines for rare bat species such as greater and lesser horseshoe and larger buildings may provide roost sites. Wilton is less constrained for development than most towns in the HMA.

**Rest of the HMA** - Very few areas in the HMA are without constraints from the National Sites Network. The majority of the HMA lies within the River Avon SAC catchment where any development must demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. The ability to achieve this varies between sub catchments with some offering virtually no offsetting opportunities. Soundness of the plan will depend on directing development to sub-catchments and WRCs where offsetting is most achievable. It may not be possible to rely on the Council's mitigation scheme for Salisbury Plain SPA where developments lie particularly close to the protected site or where housing numbers are high. Mere is the only larger settlement that is unconstrained by the National Site Network. Ludgershall, Whiteparish and Middle Winterslow lie in the Test catchment and the latter two are also within the New Forest catchment but the Council has achievable schemes for both of these protected sites so these will be easier to develop. The HMA has a high density of CWSs, priority habitat and the rarer protected species so, detailed consideration of these will be relevant to locating and designing most development schemes.

**High Post New Village** – All new development at High Post would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. At this stage it is unclear which treatment works it would discharge to. If Salisbury main works, then the same constraints would apply as for Salisbury. High Post golf course comprises priority habitat for which there is a presumption against development. If developed, the biodiversity net gain requirements would necessitate at least 3 times the area lost to urban development to be set aside for habitat creation. Most other land at High Post comprises arable or temporary leys which would be less land hungry to offset if developed. Any hedgerows in this bare landscape are likely to be valuable wildlife corridors and need to be buffered by 20m.

**Boscombe/Porton New Settlement** - there is Salisbury Plain SPA/SAC to the north, the River Avon SAC to the west, Porton Down SPA/SAC to the east, and Porton Meadows SSSI in the vicinity. The area also lies in close proximity to the non-statutory designations of Boscombe Down Railway Line LWS, Idmiston Down LWS and Countess Farm Swamp LWS. All new development at Boscombe / Porton would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. Assuming a new treatment works was provided on site (discharging to ground), this could be designed to best available techniques and any residual offsetting provided within 'the development area' close to the works thus removing the offsetting challenge faced by other developments. The area is within the zone of recreational impact for Salisbury Plain, so a development of any size may not be able to rely on the Council's mitigation scheme for stone curlew. Boscombe Down is also likely to be an important flyway for stone curlews moving between Salisbury Plain SPA and Porton Down SPA and some pairs nest on the down. Mitigation is likely to be achievable provided sufficient land can be secured separately for the birds and to offset recreational pressure. Most land at Boscombe comprises arable or temporary leys which would be less land hungry to offset for biodiversity net gain than other habitats. There is little priority habitat, and no CWS's that would significantly constrain development. Any hedgerows in this bare landscape are likely to be valuable wildlife corridors and need to be buffered by 20m

**Durrington** - All new development at Durrington would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. This will be difficult to achieve because of the limited offsetting options available at this settlement. The River Avon SAC runs north to south on the west side of Amesbury. The river and its floodplain support high biodiversity including many protected and priority species including water voles, otters, white-clawed crayfish and many species of bats and birds. All parts of the development must be located out of the floodplain to ensure the SAC can achieve its conservation objectives in the long term. Many footpaths give access to the river and development must therefore be located / designed to avoid increased recreational pressure along the riverbanks or into any areas of sensitive priority habitat which abounds here. Durrington lies within the zone of recreational influence for Salisbury Plain SPA and due to its proximity to the SPA, a larger scheme may not be able to rely on the Council's mitigation scheme for stone curlew. Given the high biodiversity surrounding this small town there may be important bat roosts to be accommodated in development design.

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

There are no LGSs (formerly Regional Sites of Geological Importance, or RIGs) in close proximity to the market towns in the Salisbury HMA.

**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 SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	Due to the ecologically sensitive designations in proximity to Amesbury and highest number of 1425 dwellings proposed for Amesbury under this strategy, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	SA-F proposes a significantly lower amount of housing of 630 dwellings. Likely effects on this objective are considered to be minor adverse overall.	SA-G proposes a similar amount of housing to SA-E. Moderate adverse effects considered likely overall against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Level of growth proposed is considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.	Growth levels proposed at Salisbury are similar in all strategies and are considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.	Level of growth proposed is considered to be significant due to the number of ecologically sensitive designations within and in close proximity to Salisbury, including significant River Avon SAC phosphate issues. Moderate adverse effects are considered likely with mitigation considered to be problematic.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	SA-E proposes higher levels of growth at Tidworth and Ludgershall. Currently it is only possible to plan for development at Ludgershall, not Tidworth, because of risks to the River Avon SAC. Given the proximity of the settlement to Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI and potential for recreational impacts, moderate adverse effects are likely.	Lower level of growth comparatively to other strategies so scope for impacts is reduced. However, currently it is only possible to plan for development at Ludgershall, not Tidworth, because of risks to the River Avon SAC. Likely minor adverse effects due to the potential recreational impacts on the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI, if development located at Ludgershall only.	SA-G proposes much higher levels of growth at Tidworth and Ludgershall. Currently it is only possible to plan for development at Ludgershall, not Tidworth, because of risks to the River Avon SAC. Given the proximity of the settlement to Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI and increased potential for recreational impacts, moderate adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	The proposed housing is not dissimilar to the level of growth allocated at Wilton by the WCS.	The proposed housing is not dissimilar to the level of growth allocated at Wilton by the WCS.	The proposed housing is not dissimilar to the level of growth allocated at Wilton by the WCS.

	<p>Wilton is ecologically less constrained for development than most other settlements in the HMA and therefore might be able to take more development. The level of growth proposed under this scenario is likely to have minor adverse effects overall.</p>	<p>Wilton is ecologically less constrained for development than most other settlements in the HMA and therefore might be able to take more development. The level of growth proposed under this scenario is likely to have minor adverse effects overall.</p>	<p>Wilton is ecologically less constrained for development than most other settlements in the HMA and therefore might be able to take more development. The level of growth proposed under this scenario is likely to have minor adverse effects overall.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	<p>The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it is possible for development at the scale proposed to avoid significantly adversely impacting areas of ecological sensitivity. The significance of effects will vary depending on which sub- catchment of the River Avon SAC development is located in. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall on this objective.</p>	<p>The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it is possible for development at the scale proposed to avoid significantly adversely impacting areas of ecological sensitivity. The significance of effects will vary depending on which sub- catchment of the River Avon SAC development is located in. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall on this objective.</p>	<p>The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it is possible for development at the scale proposed to avoid significantly adversely impacting areas of ecological sensitivity. The significance of effects will vary depending on which sub- catchment of the River Avon SAC development is located in. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall on this objective.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	<p>All new development at High Post would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. At this stage it is unclear which treatment works it would discharge to. If Salisbury main works, then the same constraints would apply as for Salisbury. Provided priority habitat is avoided, impacts may be slightly reduced compared to development at Salisbury where recreational effects are likely at sites in the National Site Network.</p>	<p>No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.</p>	<p>All new development at High Post would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. At this stage it is unclear which treatment works it would discharge to. If Salisbury main works, then the same constraints would apply as for Salisbury. Provided priority habitat is avoided, impacts may be slightly reduced compared to development at Salisbury where recreational effects are likely at sites in the National Site Network.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/ Porton New Settlement</b>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.</p>	<p>At Porton/Boscombe Down there are a number of statutory designations likely to be in close proximity. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of likely effect on this objective. Further ecological assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. However, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered to reduce any impacts.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>

<b>Durrington</b>	The issues for developing at Durrington are similar to those at Amesbury but the reduced housing numbers reduce the uncertainty of being able to overcome them.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 1 for each strategy</b>	<b>-1.6 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.7 Moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-F is considered to be the most sustainable strategy against this objective. Strategy SA-G is considered the least sustainable option** but there is very little difference between strategies SA-E and SA-G.
- The two higher growth strategies at Amesbury, and all strategies at Salisbury, are likely to have significant adverse effects.
- The two higher growth strategies at Tidworth and Ludgershall are also likely to have significant adverse effects - currently it is only possible to plan for development at Ludgershall, not Tidworth, because of risks to the River Avon SAC. Given the proximity of the settlement to the Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA/SSSI and the potential for recreational impacts, higher growth strategies are likely to have significant effects.
- All new development at Wilton would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. The relatively modest levels of growth proposed by each strategy are likely to have minor adverse effects overall.
- The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. Due to the broad geographical area of Rest of HMA, it is possible for development at the scale proposed to avoid significantly adversely impacting areas of ecological sensitivity, but the significance of effects will vary depending on which sub- catchment of the River Avon SAC development is located in.
- All new development at High Post would lie within the River Avon SAC catchment and must therefore demonstrate phosphorus neutrality. Levels of growth proposed under strategies SA-E and SA-G are likely to have significant adverse effects.
- In the Porton/Boscombe Down area, development will impact Salisbury Plain SPA and the River Avon SAC. Significant adverse effects are considered likely given the land take requirements for mitigation and the technological uncertainties.
- The issues for developing at Durrington are similar to those at Amesbury but the reduced housing numbers reduce the uncertainty of being able to overcome them. Minor adverse effects are likely.

**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 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, 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 land surrounding the built-up area of **Salisbury** is classified as Grade 3 (good to moderate) agricultural land, with some spokes of Grade 4 (poor) extending outwards around the River Bourne, Avon and Nadder. There are also some small patches of Grade 2 to the north-west, north-east, south-east and south.

**Wilton** is surrounded by a mixture of Grades 2, 3 and 4 with Grades 2 and 3 forming the majority of the surrounding agricultural land.

**Durrington** is surrounded by mostly Grade 3 agricultural land with smaller pockets of Grades 2 and 4. Much of the wider area around Durrington is MoD land and non-agricultural.

At **Amesbury**, while the area around the River Avon which runs from north to south on the western side of the settlement is classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, the majority of land within and outside Amesbury is Grade 3 apart from patches of Grade 2 to the north and north-east.

While **Tidworth** lies in an area of non-agricultural land, **Ludgershall** is surrounded by mainly Grade 3 agricultural land with the western side being non-agricultural.

Excluding the urban areas, the majority of the **Rest of the HMA** including potentially the area of **Porton / Boscombe Down** is classified as being Grade 3 agricultural land, with some strips of Grade 2 and Grade 4 land around the rivers. Much of the area around the **High Post** area of search is classified as Grade 2 with a smaller area of Grade 3.

**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?**

With regards to mineral resources, there are several Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) around **Salisbury** and **Wilton**. There is also a Mineral Resource Zones associated with the Salisbury Avon and one at south-east of Salisbury.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	This strategy proposes 1425 dwellings at Amesbury. This will very likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. This is also likely to lead to the loss of mainly Grade 3 agricultural land. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of Grade 2 BMV and also Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely overall.	This strategy proposes 630 dwellings at Amesbury. This will also very likely require development of greenfield land due to the very limited amount of PDL in Amesbury. This is also likely to lead to the loss of mainly Grade 3 agricultural land. It would be possible for development to avoid areas of Grade 2 BMV and also Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely overall.	This strategy proposes 1365 dwellings at Amesbury and effects are likely to be very similar to that of Strategy SA-E. Minor adverse effects on this objective are likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.	All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>

<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. It is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. It is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.	Due to the lack of BMV land surrounding Tidworth/Ludgershall, it is considered likely that significant loss of BMV land could be avoided but due to lack of PDL, significant greenfield development will be needed. It is unlikely that MSA will be affected. Minor adverse effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	SA-E proposes a higher level of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than SA-E. Development would be likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. Through this scale of growth, it is possible that development could more likely avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.	This strategy proposes a lower level of growth than SA-E. Development would be likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. Through this scale of growth, it is possible that development could more likely avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	This is a large rural area with little previously developed land available to meet this requirement (2,005 dwellings). So greenfield, agricultural land will likely be lost to development. Furthermore, 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. Due to the presence of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield, agricultural land, moderate adverse effects are considered likely overall.	This is a large rural area with little previously developed land available to meet this requirement (2,090 dwellings). So greenfield, agricultural land will likely be lost to development. Furthermore, 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. Due to the presence of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield, agricultural land, moderate adverse effects are considered likely overall.	This is a large rural area with little previously developed land available to meet this requirement (2,090 dwellings). So greenfield, agricultural land will likely be lost to development. Furthermore, 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. Due to the presence of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Regardless, due to the likely significant loss of greenfield, agricultural land, moderate adverse effects are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	The development of a new settlement in this area would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. There is a large area of Grade 2 BMV land to the south/south-west of High Post, and also Grade 3 land, a significant amount of which is likely to be lost to development. Given the undeveloped, agricultural nature of this area, significant land contamination issues are unlikely. A new settlement here could avoid sterilising mineral resources and could be built at densities that make efficient use of land. Overall, due to the significant greenfield land take expected, a significant amount of which could be higher	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement at High Post in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	The development of a new settlement in this area would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. There is a large area of Grade 2 BMV land to the south/south-west of High Post, and also Grade 3 land, a significant amount of which is likely to be lost to development. Given the undeveloped, agricultural nature of this area, significant land contamination issues are unlikely. A new settlement here could avoid sterilising mineral resources and could be built at densities that make efficient use of land. Overall, due to the significant greenfield land take expected, a significant amount of which could be higher grade

	grade agricultural land, significant adverse impacts on this objective are considered likely.		agricultural land, significant adverse impacts on this objective are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	The development of a new settlement of this size in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. Most of this is likely to be Grade 3 BMV with a smaller amount of Grade 2. If any land has previously been used for military purposes, then there may be a potential contamination risk. A new settlement here could avoid sterilising mineral resources and could be built at densities that make efficient use of land. Overall, due to the significant greenfield land take expected, some of which could be higher grade agricultural land, significant adverse impacts on this objective are considered likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	This is a relatively small housing requirement that is likely to met on greenfield agricultural land. Durrington is surrounded by Grade 3 agricultural land with smaller pockets of Grades 2 and 4. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 2</b>	<b>-1.4 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-E is the most sustainable strategy against this objective. SA-F and SA-G are the least sustainable.** However, there is very little difference between the three strategies.
- There is a lack of previously developed land (PDL) across the HMA. Therefore, all strategies are likely to result in the loss of greenfield and agricultural land and will potentially lead to the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 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 negative effects will occur in all strategies.
- All strategies for Salisbury propose significant levels of growth which is likely to take place primarily on greenfield land due to a lack of PDL. It is possible that development could avoid significant loss of BMV land and avoid the MSA areas. However, due to the scale of likely growth and problematic mitigation, moderate adverse effects are likely.
- It would be possible for development at Amesbury, Tidworth/Ludgershall and Wilton to avoid areas of BMV agricultural land and also Mineral Safeguarding Areas.
- The Rest of the HMA is a large rural area with little previously developed land available to meet the proposed requirements (2,005 – 2,090 dwellings). So greenfield, agricultural land will likely be lost to development. The majority of the Rest of the HMA is classified as Grade 3 land and further assessment would be needed to distinguish the areas of Grade 3a and Grade 3b to understand the extent of BMV land. Due to the presence of Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Mineral Resource Blocks and BMV land in the Rest of the HMA, the potential for likely adverse effects is dependent on where growth is located. Regardless, due to the likely loss of greenfield, agricultural land, minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.



- The development of a new settlement at High Post would likely take place on greenfield, agricultural land. There is a large area of Grade 2 BMV land to the south/south-west of High Post, and also Grade 3 land, a significant amount of which is likely to be lost to development. Given the undeveloped, agricultural nature of this area, significant land contamination issues are unlikely. A new settlement here could avoid sterilising mineral resources and could be built at densities that make efficient use of land.
- The development of a new settlement of this size in the Boscombe Down/Porton area would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. Most of this is likely to be Grade 3 BMV with a smaller amount of Grade 2. If any land has previously been used for military purposes, then there may be a potential contamination risk. A new settlement here could avoid sterilising mineral resources and could be built at densities that make efficient use of land. Overall, due to the significant greenfield land take expected, some of which could be higher grade agricultural land, significant adverse impacts on this objective are considered likely.
- A relatively small housing requirement is proposed at Durrington. This is likely to be delivered on greenfield agricultural land. Durrington is surrounded by Grade 3 agricultural land with smaller pockets of Grades 2 and 4 and minor adverse effects are considered likely overall.
- To achieve better sustainability outcomes against this objective, new development should try to maximise use of any areas of PDL and avoid areas of BMV agricultural land, where possible. And development at higher densities would help to reduce loss of greenfield land.
- The majority of the HMA is Grade 3 land. Therefore, in order to identify which areas are more suitable for development and less likely to lead to adverse effects, further assessment is likely to be needed to distinguish between Grade 3a land and Grade 3b land.

### **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?**

**Salisbury** is surrounded by several Source Protection Zones. These are a mix of Zones 1 (Inner Protection Zone), 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 (Total Catchment). These are positioned to the east/north-east of Salisbury, beyond Laverstock; to the north of Salisbury, at and beyond Old Sarum; and in the St. Pauls and Bemerton/Bemerton Heath areas of the city. There is one Drinking Water Protection Area to the south/south-east of Salisbury. Additionally, there is a Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface) to the east of Salisbury and a Drinking Water Safeguarding Area (Groundwater) to the north of Salisbury and to the south-west of Wilton.

**Amesbury** is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south-east. This is a Zone 3 (Total Catchment Zone). Further to the south a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) are apparent. There are no Drinking Water Protected Areas at Amesbury.

**Boscombe/Porton** has a Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) to the west and north-west. This is to the south-east of Amesbury. Further to the south of Amesbury is a Source Protection Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater).

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is subject to a large amount of water protection. Tidworth and its surrounds are covered by Source Protection Zones: Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone), Zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and Zone 3 (Total Catchment). Additionally, a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater) is apparent. Ludgershall and its surrounds are subject to a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Surface Water). This spreads beyond the settlement to the south. Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) is apparent to the east of the settlement.

Similar to Salisbury, **Wilton** is surrounded by several Source Protection Zones. These include areas of Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3 to the south of the town. This area also includes a Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Groundwater). Land to the north of the town stretches south-easterly towards Salisbury and also includes Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3. There are no Drinking Water Protected Areas at Wilton.

The **High Post** community is situated entirely on Source protection zone 2 (Outer Protection Zone). The south of the catchment between Lower Woodford and Old Sarum is situated in Source Protection Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone).

**Durrington** - the centre of Durrington is covered by Source Protection Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone). SPZ 2 and 3 then stretch up towards the Northwest towards Figheldean and beyond. There are areas around Larkhill, Bulford where there is no SPZ in place.

**Rest of the HMA** - while there are rural settlements in the HMA which are within Source Protection Zones, Drinking Water Protected Areas or Drinking Water Safeguard Zones, there are also plenty of rural settlements where development could occur without posing 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 **Salisbury**, Wessex Water’s AMP7 growth scheme has been reprioritised, and therefore improvements to sewage treatment infrastructure are highly likely to be required to support development at Salisbury. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre.

At **Amesbury**, there is a significant probability that infrastructure improvement would be required to accommodate development. With regard to sewage treatment works (STW) capacity, it is anticipated that significant investment will be required to accommodate development at Amesbury to increase Dry Weather Flow (DWF) consent and tighten sanitary permits. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre (WRC).

Wessex Water have not outlined any plans to invest in the local water network at **Tidworth/Ludgershall**.

**Wilton** - guidance is required from Wessex Water but there are no major concerns in relation to surface water drainage at Wilton.

**High Post** - guidance is required from Wessex Water but there are no major concerns in relation to surface water drainage at High Post.

**Durrington** - guidance is required from Wessex Water but there are no major concerns in relation to surface water drainage at Durrington.

**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 SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south-east of the town. This strategy proposes 1425 dwellings at Amesbury. There is a significant probability that infrastructure improvement would be required to accommodate development. With regard to sewage treatment works (STW) capacity, it is anticipated that significant investment will be required to accommodate development at Amesbury to increase Dry Weather Flow (DWF) consent and tighten sanitary permits. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre (WRC). Moderate adverse effects are considered likely for this strategy.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south-east of the town. This strategy proposes 630 dwellings at Amesbury. There is a significant probability that infrastructure improvement would be required to accommodate development. With regard to sewage treatment works (STW) capacity, it is anticipated that significant investment will be required to accommodate development at Amesbury to increase Dry Weather Flow (DWF) consent and tighten sanitary permits. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre (WRC). Moderate adverse effects are considered likely for this strategy.	Amesbury is subject to a Source Protection Zone to the south-east of the town. This strategy proposes 1365 dwellings at Amesbury. There is a significant probability that infrastructure improvement would be required to accommodate development. With regard to sewage treatment works (STW) capacity, it is anticipated that significant investment will be required to accommodate development at Amesbury to increase Dry Weather Flow (DWF) consent and tighten sanitary permits. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre (WRC). Moderate adverse effects are considered likely for this strategy.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>

<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Wessex Water's AMP7 growth scheme has been reprioritised, and therefore improvements to sewage treatment infrastructure are highly likely to be required to support development at Salisbury. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre. Due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Wessex Water's AMP7 growth scheme has been reprioritised, and therefore improvements to sewage treatment infrastructure are highly likely to be required to support development at Salisbury. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre. Due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury which has a number of water protection designations including Zone 1 SPZ and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. Wessex Water's AMP7 growth scheme has been reprioritised, and therefore improvements to sewage treatment infrastructure are highly likely to be required to support development at Salisbury. Likely AMP8 phosphorus driver (by 2030), which can be aligned with capacity upgrades at the Water Recycling Centre. Due to the scale of growth proposed, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This strategy proposes a higher level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. Due to there being some uncertainties regarding water infrastructure capacity at Tidworth and Ludgershall, as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a lower level of proportional growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. However, due to there being some uncertainties regarding water infrastructure capacity at Tidworth and Ludgershall, as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.	This strategy proposes a much higher level of growth at Tidworth/ Ludgershall. Due to there being some uncertainties regarding water infrastructure capacity at Tidworth and Ludgershall, as well as having a large amount of water protection designations in and around the settlement, including a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone, it is likely that there would be moderate adverse effects.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	Wilton is subject to water source protection designations around the town, including Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. But the level of growth proposed in this scenario is not likely to have significant effects on these or on existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall against this objective.	Wilton is subject to water source protection designations around the town, including Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. But the level of growth proposed in this scenario is not likely to have significant effects on these or on existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall against this objective.	Wilton is subject to water source protection designations around the town, including Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones. But the level of growth proposed in this scenario is not likely to have significant effects on these or on existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure. Minor adverse effects are considered likely overall against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	There are rural areas within this HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Areas, but there are also plenty of areas at the rural settlements or in the countryside where development could occur without posing a risk to water resources. Development in this area is likely to be more dispersed which may mean that the existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. Overall, the delivery of growth under this strategy is considered likely to have minor adverse effects against this objective.	There are rural areas within this HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Areas, but there are also plenty of areas at the rural settlements or in the countryside where development could occur without posing a risk to water resources. Development in this area is likely to be more dispersed which may mean that the existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. Overall, the delivery of growth under this strategy is considered likely to have minor adverse effects against this objective.	There are rural areas within this HMA which are within Source Protection Zones or Drinking Water Protected Areas, but there are also plenty of areas at the rural settlements or in the countryside where development could occur without posing a risk to water resources. Development in this area is likely to be more dispersed which may mean that the existing water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure can handle the additional capacity. Overall, the delivery of growth under this strategy is considered likely to have minor adverse effects against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	The High Post area of search is covered by Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, including Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones (Groundwater). Significant new water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure will be required to serve a new settlement in this location which has little existing residential development. There are concerns that the relatively low number of new homes proposed would not make this viable. Moderate adverse effects considered likely overall against this objective.	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	The High Post area of search is covered by Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, including Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones (Groundwater). Significant new water/sewerage/drainage infrastructure will be required to serve a new settlement in this location which has little existing residential development. There are concerns that the relatively low number of new homes proposed would not make this viable. Moderate adverse effects considered likely overall against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	The main concerns with a new settlement in the Boscombe Down/Porton area relate to the potential impacts on the water and wastewater network capacity. There are currently no plans to invest further in the local water network by Wessex Water at Amesbury, which is the closest settlement located near to Boscombe/Porton. However, this is not to say that the required infrastructure could not be delivered. It is likely that development would take place towards the latter part of the plan period due to long lead in times. This strategy proposes growth in a different location to those which form part of the current strategy and so an increased impact on this area is likely in comparison. The area around Boscombe/Porton also has a Source Protection Zone 3 (Total Catchment) to the west and north-west. This is to the south-east of Amesbury. Overall, significant adverse effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new settlement in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	Durrington is subject to a large area of Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3 that covers the existing built form of Durrington. However, the relatively low number of new homes proposed is not likely to significantly impact these or existing infrastructure. Minor effects likely overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 3</b>	<b>-1.6 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.7 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.7 Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b>			

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-E is the most sustainable strategy against this objective** as it is judged to have marginally fewer adverse effects. **Strategies SA-F and SA-G are considered the least sustainable options** with a marginally greater number of likely adverse effects
- All of the areas of search within the HMA are affected to some degree by Source Protection Zones, which would need to be considered in further detail including consultation with the Environment Agency, if development were to be allocated in such areas. Drinking Water Safeguard Zones and Drinking Water Protected Areas are also present in most areas within the HMA (excluding Amesbury and Durrington). All strategies therefore have the potential to affect water protected areas
- Additional development beyond what is already planned for may require further investment in respect of water services infrastructure. Until detail is available on which sites are to be allocated it is difficult to determine whether capacity issues will already have been addressed by planned improvements or whether further works will be required
- Based on the information that is currently available from water service providers, it is understood that recent improvements have been made at Amesbury to increase capacity of the local water network although further investment to STWs would be required to support additional development at Amesbury and/or the Porton/Boscombe proposal
- There are understood to be planned investments by Wessex Water to reduce phosphates and increase capacity of the water network at Salisbury
- There are uncertainties regarding water infrastructure capacity at Tidworth and Ludgershall
- Development in the rural areas may require additional investment from the water service providers

#### **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)?**

**Salisbury** currently has 3 long standing AQMAs for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide. Air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock.

The most recent assessment of **Amesbury** found that the settlement faces few air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in Amesbury. The settlement continues to be monitored. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is not currently assessed as having particular air quality issues and there are no AQMAs in the settlement. Diffusion tubes to monitor pollutant levels were introduced to each town in 2019.

**Wilton** does not currently have any AQMAs, although air quality is currently monitored. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.

**High Post** area of search is not subject to any AQMAs and is in an area of open countryside. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.

**Durrington** is not currently assessed as having any particular air quality issues. Air quality within nearby Amesbury continues to be monitored.

The growth allocated within the **Rest of the HMA** may place development in locations where increases in other pollutants such as noise and light may occur, in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and a lack of public transport provision suggests that development in these areas may lead to an increased number of private car journeys magnifying the likelihood of pollutants from vehicles.

A new community in **Boscombe/Porton** would be likely to place pressure on air quality in the locality and would be placed in a location where there is currently no monitoring being undertaken. It is unclear whether it would lead to an exceedance of nitrogen dioxide in the area at this stage.

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

Consultation risk zones have been considered very broadly for this high-level stage of appraisal. Site specific analysis of major hazard constraints will be considered at lower-level stages.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	<p>Amesbury currently faces few air-quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.</p> <p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. The proximity of MoD Boscombe Down will also require careful consideration for any development proposals.</p> <p>Some of the settlement is affected by safeguarding areas associated with the nearby Boscombe Down. Moderate adverse effects likely for this strategy overall.</p>	<p>Amesbury currently faces few air-quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.</p> <p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. The proximity of MoD Boscombe Down will also require careful consideration for any development proposals.</p> <p>Some of the settlement is affected by safeguarding areas associated with the nearby Boscombe Down. Minor adverse effects considered likely for this strategy as the proposed level of growth of just 630 dwellings is much less likely to have significant impacts.</p>	<p>Amesbury currently faces few air-quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. It is however on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic.</p> <p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. The proximity of MoD Boscombe Down will also require careful consideration for any development proposals. Some of the settlement is affected by safeguarding areas associated with the nearby Boscombe Down. Moderate adverse effects likely for this strategy overall.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads.</p> <p>For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.</p>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads.</p> <p>For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.</p>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are three long-standing AQMAs in Salisbury and air quality is currently being monitored in Salisbury, Wilton and Laverstock. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. For all strategies moderate adverse effects are likely in Salisbury as mitigation will be problematic.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective.</p> <p>Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in the two settlements. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is</p>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective.</p> <p>Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in the two settlements. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is</p>	<p>All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective.</p> <p>Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs in the two settlements. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects, but mitigation is achievable. The proximity</p>

	achievable. The proximity of MoD sites will require careful consideration for any development proposals. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	achievable. The proximity of MoD sites will require careful consideration for any development proposals. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.	of MoD sites will require careful consideration for any development proposals. Likely minor adverse effects for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are currently two tubes monitoring air quality in Wilton. Nearby Salisbury is subject to three AQMAs, including along Wilton Road which provides a route between Wilton and Salisbury City Centre. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads. As this strategy proposes a higher scale of growth, mitigation is more problematic. A moderate adverse effect is likely overall.	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are currently two tubes monitoring air quality in Wilton. Nearby Salisbury is subject to three AQMAs, including along Wilton Road which provides a route between Wilton and Salisbury City Centre. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads, but SA-F proposes a lower scale of growth and mitigation could be more easily achieved. A minor adverse effect is likely overall.	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. There are currently two tubes monitoring air quality in Wilton. Nearby Salisbury is subject to three AQMAs, including along Wilton Road which provides a route between Wilton and Salisbury City Centre. Additional development is likely to increase pressures on local roads, but SA-G proposes a lower scale of growth and mitigation could be more easily achieved. A minor adverse effect is likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Development in this area is likely to be widely dispersed amongst many settlements so impacts will be quite localised. Development may increase noise and light pollution in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and often poor public transport provision suggests that development in some areas will lead to an increased number of private car journeys, magnifying the likelihood of pollutants from vehicles. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development locations, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects overall on this objective.	Development in this area is likely to be widely dispersed amongst many settlements so impacts will be quite localised. Development may increase noise and light pollution in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and often poor public transport provision suggests that development in some areas will lead to an increased number of private car journeys, magnifying the likelihood of pollutants from vehicles. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development locations, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects overall on this objective.	Development in this area is likely to be widely dispersed amongst many settlements so impacts will be quite localised. Development may increase noise and light pollution in areas where this is not currently an issue. The dispersed nature of facilities and often poor public transport provision suggests that development in some areas will lead to an increased number of private car journeys, magnifying the likelihood of pollutants from vehicles. All new development is likely to have some adverse effects in terms of air, noise, light and other pollutants. Due to uncertainties in development locations, it is likely that there would be minor adverse effects overall on this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. The High Post area is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. However, it is located on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic. The nearby Chemring Countermeasures has a designated safeguarding area potentially affecting land at High Post, and any new development may require appropriate separation distances to the facility.	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. The High Post area is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. However, it is located on major road networks that feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic. The nearby Chemring Countermeasures has a designated safeguarding area potentially affecting land at High Post, and any new development may require appropriate separation distances to the facility.

	There is also a large pig farm to the west of the search area. Further investigation will be required as to the potential for odour issues. Likely moderate adverse effects for this strategy overall.		There is also a large pig farm to the west of the search area. Further investigation will be required as to the potential for odour issues. Likely moderate adverse effects for this strategy overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	The Boscombe Down/Porton area is not currently the subject of any AQMAs. It is however on road networks that have the potential to feed into Salisbury that has several AQMAs, where significant traffic management or other measures are needed to remove significant levels of traffic. A new community of this size would be likely to negatively impact on local air quality due to significantly increased levels of traffic, as well as short-term construction activity. New development will also increase local levels of noise and light pollution. However, due to the scale of the development there is potential, over time, for the settlement to develop a level of self-containment which could limit the number of journeys required to be made to nearby settlements, thereby reducing air pollution. Some of the area may be affected by safeguarding areas associated with the nearby Boscombe Down. As no specific location is known, but development is likely to be located in an area of open countryside which currently has little in the way of development, moderate adverse effects are considered likely at this stage.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	All new development is likely to have some adverse effects against this objective. Durrington is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are no AQMAs designated. Given the relatively low amount of growth proposed for this settlement, minor adverse effects are likely overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 4</b>	<b>-1.6 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.3 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, <b>Strategy SA-F is considered to be the most sustainable strategy against this objective</b> as it is likely to result in fewer adverse effects overall. Strategy <b>SA-E is considered to be the least sustainable option</b> under this objective, with the greater number of adverse effects considered likely.</li> <li>All development strategies lead to additional development and are therefore likely to lead to increased environmental pollution in all locations. However, as development locations are not known, likely effects and potential mitigation measures are difficult to predict.</li> </ul>			



- In respect of air quality, all strategies in Salisbury are considered likely to result in significant adverse effects because of the scale of growth and the fact that Salisbury already has considerable pressures on the local transport network and three existing AQMAs
- At Porton/Boscombe Down and High Post there may be opportunities to ensure that minimising air pollution is factored in at an early stage in settlement design and masterplanning. However, there is some risk that introducing new large-scale development could lead to deterioration of air quality, such as in the Boscombe/Porton area where there are identified pinch points that are not yet monitored for exceedance of nitrogen dioxide
- Amesbury does not have an AQMA, but significant development here could nonetheless lead to significant adverse effects. Large scale development at Amesbury, High Post and Porton/Boscombe also have the potential to feed into the highways network entering Salisbury, where there are already three AQMAs
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is not currently assessed as facing air quality issues and there are currently no AQMAs, although large scale development is likely to lead to some adverse effects
- Strategies involving development at Wilton and Durrington are likely to lead to some adverse effects, although the scale of development is lower than at the higher tier settlements and therefore effects are likely to be less significant
- All three strategies propose a similar level of development in the Rest of HMA area, which is likely to lead to some adverse effects albeit spread across a wide geography; this is not anticipated to be significant
- In all locations, there may be opportunities to minimise the impacts of air pollution through the selection of sites that are in accessible locations thus reducing the need to travel by private car; promoting policies that require development/improvement of sustainable transport links (such as direct, safe and user-friendly walking and cycling routes); and introducing onsite and offsite vegetation to enable carbon absorption and pollutant filtration
- With regards to noise and light pollution, these are generally the result of urban development. It is expected that specific policies or policy criteria can be introduced to ensure that development can be mitigated to avoid such impacts, or that development can be directed to locations where such impacts would be 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 Zones 2 or 3? If so, are there alternative sites in the area within Flood Zone 1 that can be allocated in preference to developing land in Flood Zones 2 or 3? (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 flooding form part of the settlement-level analysis below. The cumulative effect of development was also considered in order to identify those catchments where an increase in flows as a result of development would have the greatest effect 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:

**Salisbury** is at high risk of river flooding and at low risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

**Wilton** – groundwater risk in Wilton is generally low, surface water risk is moderate in this area, a number of the roads in the centre of the settlement are at risk of surface water flooding. As there is considerable fluvial risk on the outside of the settlement, surface water flooding will continue with little area to drain to in heavy rainfall periods. Flood Zones 2 & 3 cover the majority of the Wilton settlement, following the main rivers.

**Amesbury** is at low risk of river and groundwater flooding and at moderate risk of surface water flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. The cumulative effect of development is assessed as moderate.

**High Post new community** – groundwater risk at High Post is generally low, surface water risk in this settlement is low. This area is at low risk of fluvial flooding

**Porton/Boscombe area** – groundwater risk at Porton/Boscombe is generally low, surface water flood risk is also low and follows the pluvial risk zones. The settlement is at medium risk of fluvial flooding, the areas at risk follow the route of the river Bourne.

**Durrington** - groundwater flood risk at Durrington is moderate with higher risk areas east of the A345. Durrington is surrounded by the River Avon FZ2 & FZ3a (CC) and the immediate areas outside the current settlement are located within the flood zone areas. The surface water risk in the area tends to follow the fluvial risk so no additional risk added. The settlement is at medium risk of fluvial flooding, the areas of concern follow the River Avon.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	Amesbury is at low risk of river and groundwater flooding. The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely for all three strategies.	Amesbury is at low risk of river and groundwater flooding. The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely for all three strategies.	Amesbury is at low risk of river and groundwater flooding. The town's flood issues are principally related to surface water. The River Avon flows to the west of the town. New development is likely to be able to avoid areas of flood risk. Minor adverse effects are therefore likely for all three strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. This lower level of development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. This lower level of development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.	The city is particularly at risk through fluvial flooding arising from the Avon and four other rivers that converge. This lower level of development may be able to take place without increasing flood risk but as site locations are not known, all strategies for Salisbury is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects given the scale of growth proposed.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.	Tidworth/Ludgershall is at low risk of river flooding and at moderate risk of surface water and groundwater flooding. Development proposed under all strategies should be able to take place without significant impacts. Minor adverse likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	Similar to Salisbury, Wilton is subject to fluvial flood risk. There is some potential for this level of development to be directed away from areas most at risk. However, this strategy for Wilton is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects due to a limited scope for mitigation at the town.	Similar to Salisbury, Wilton is subject to fluvial flood risk. However, this much lower level of development proposed may be able to take place in locations without increasing flood risk. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.	Similar to Salisbury, Wilton is subject to fluvial flood risk. However, this much lower level of development proposed may be able to take place in locations without increasing flood risk. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>Rest of HMA</b>	<p>This level of proposed development in such a wide rural area could be located in places that avoid flood risk areas and where there are some local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. However, all new development in rural areas currently is likely to increase private car journeys somewhat and lead to some increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Many potential development sites will also offer opportunities for production of renewable and/or low carbon energy' however.</p> <p>At this strategic stage, without knowing details of specific sites, minor adverse effects are likely overall.</p>	<p>This level of proposed development in such a wide rural area could be located in places that avoid flood risk areas and where there are some local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. However, all new development in rural areas currently is likely to increase private car journeys somewhat and lead to some increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Many potential development sites will also offer opportunities for production of renewable and/or low carbon energy' however.</p> <p>At this strategic stage, without knowing details of specific sites, minor adverse effects are likely overall.</p>	<p>This level of proposed development in such a wide rural area could be located in places that avoid flood risk areas and where there are some local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. However, all new development in rural areas currently is likely to increase private car journeys somewhat and lead to some increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Many potential development sites will also offer opportunities for production of renewable and/or low carbon energy' however.</p> <p>At this strategic stage, without knowing details of specific sites, minor adverse effects are likely overall.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	<p>A new settlement of this size at High Post will lead to an increase in private car journeys and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, both during construction and operational phases. However, building a new settlement from scratch provides some opportunities to plan for a more sustainable place that has good public transport and active travel links, energy efficient buildings and that achieves significant biodiversity net gain. However, for this scale of development, there is likely to be some reliance on the nearby higher tier settlements to serve some of the settlement's needs. Within this area of search, a new village could be located in an area that has low flood risk and which is reasonably close to existing urban areas of Amesbury and Salisbury with their local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. There may also be opportunities for renewable and low-carbon energy generation on-site.</p> <p>At this strategic stage, without knowing details of specific sites, moderate adverse effects are likely overall against this objective.</p>	<p>No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.</p>	<p>A new settlement of this size at High Post will lead to an increase in private car journeys and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, both during construction and operational phases. However, building a new settlement from scratch provides some opportunities to plan for a more sustainable place that has good public transport and active travel links, energy efficient buildings and that achieves significant biodiversity net gain. However, for this scale of development, there is likely to be some reliance on the nearby higher tier settlements to serve some of the settlement's needs. Within this area of search, a new village could be located in an area that has low flood risk and which is reasonably close to existing urban areas of Amesbury and Salisbury with their local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. There may also be opportunities for renewable and low-carbon energy generation on-site.</p> <p>At this strategic stage, without knowing details of specific sites, moderate adverse effects are likely overall against this objective.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.</p>	<p>A new settlement of this size is likely to lead to an increase in private car journeys and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, both during construction and operational phases. However, building a new settlement from scratch provides many opportunities to plan for a more self-contained and sustainable place that has good public transport and active travel links, energy efficient buildings and that achieves significant biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.</p>

		A new settlement can be located in an area that has low flood risk and which is reasonably close to an existing urban area such as Amesbury with its local services and facilities, thereby reducing the need to travel. There may also be opportunities for renewable and low-carbon energy generation on-site. At this strategic stage, minor adverse effects are likely overall against this objective.	
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	Groundwater flood risk at Durrington is moderate with higher risk areas east of the A345. The immediate areas outside the current settlement are located within FZ2 and FZ3. Surface water risk in the area tends to follow the fluvial risk so no additional risk added. The settlement is at medium risk of fluvial flooding and the areas of concern follow the River Avon. Given the flood risks outlined above at Durrington, moderate adverse effects are considered likely without further details of potential sites.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 5</b>	<b>-1.6 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.2 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.3 Minor adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-F is considered to be the most sustainable strategy against this objective** as it is likely to give rise to fewer adverse effects overall. Strategy **SA-E is considered the least sustainable option** with a greater number of adverse effects considered likely.
- Whilst all areas across Salisbury HMA demonstrate some areas at risk of flooding, the most constrained locations are Salisbury and Wilton. All strategies propose a significant amount of growth at Salisbury and therefore there is a likelihood of significant effects at Salisbury. A new settlement in the Porton/Boscombe Down area, and to a lesser degree a new village at High Post, offer opportunities that could promote flood resilience and could offer strategic solutions to flooding elsewhere.
- More detailed assessment of site-specific risks of flooding and potential for sites to deliver renewable and low carbon sources of energy will follow in subsequent stages of assessment.

**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 reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets, these will be appraised in more detail at site-specific stage. At this strategic stage in/around the settlements the following is to be noted.

**Salisbury:** Growth in/around Salisbury could notably impact upon heritage assets including Salisbury Cathedral / setting, Old Sarum scheduled monument and the city's conservation areas and settings. Outward development could compromise the separate identities of surrounding historic settlements.

**Amesbury:** potential for adverse impacts on a number of important heritage features, including the Abbey/setting, the conservation area and the setting of the World Heritage Site to the town's west. Development could impact on the separate identities of neighbouring historic settlements.

The **Boscombe/Porton** area is archaeologically sensitive. The Stonehenge WHS is situated a little way to the west of Boscombe Down. There is potential for adverse effect on its setting through massing, light and increased traffic, all of which might adversely impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the Stonehenge Landscape. There are further conservation areas and both Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings within the wider landscape, including within settlements such as Idmiston, Boscombe, Newton Tony and Allington, that may be adversely affected by large scale development, while the setting of Scheduled Monuments in the wider area, such as Figsbury Ring could also be impacted upon. Significant development could impact on the separate identities/character of the historic spring-line settlements along the Bourne Valley.

This is also another significant tranche of largely undeveloped chalk downland, largely on the upper valley slopes of the River Bourne. Although a marginally less prominent location than AS – G, the settings of nationally important monuments on Idmiston and Porton Downs on the opposite side of the River Bourne valley will need to be considered. There are no designated heritage assets within the outlined area but there are Bronze Age barrows, extensive ancient field systems, and several prehistoric and Roman settlement enclosures. Assessment and evaluation may demonstrate that some of these undesignated heritage assets are of sufficiently high significance that they are worthy of preservation in situ. The potential for as yet unidentified buried remains of importance, and potentially of national significance, is high. For example, the 'Amesbury Archer', one of the most significant Early Bronze Age (c. 2,300 BC) burials in England, was found in 2002 on the opposite side of Boscombe Down airfield. Until the land has been subject to assessment and evaluation, the full extent of archaeological constraints cannot be determined. The resource and time required to undertake appropriate assessment and evaluation should not be underestimated. Wiltshire's Historic Landscape Character Assessment shows that the current field pattern is largely of 18th- and 19th-century date and not of significant heritage value.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall:** Ludgershall has its Castle (scheduled monument) and a historic core conservation area with numerous listed buildings and their respective settings. Tidworth, meanwhile, includes the designed settings of Tedworth House and Tidworth Barracks.

**Wilton** has origins in the anglo-saxon period, pre-dating Salisbury as a service centre. As such, there are several notable historic assets within the centre, south and south-east of the town, including Grade I listed Wilton House, surrounding Grade I registered Wilton Park, Wilton Conservation Area, two Scheduled Monuments and numerous other listed buildings. Due to the relationship with nearby Salisbury, consideration of Salisbury Cathedral and setting and other historic assets is required. Development in/around Wilton could adversely impact upon assets including Wilton House, Wilton Park registered park & garden, the conservation area and St Mary & Nicholas Church scheduled monument.

**High Post new community:** Well-contained development may be able to avoid adverse impacts on heritage assets. However, this is a significant tranche of largely undeveloped chalk downland at a high point in the local landscape. Although there are no designated heritage assets within the outlined area, bar a listed milestone at High Post, there are extensive ancient field systems and several prehistoric and Roman settlement enclosures. Assessment and evaluation may demonstrate that some of these undesignated heritage assets are of sufficiently high significance that they are worthy of preservation in situ. The site's prominent location within the landscape means that the impact on the settings of nationally important monuments such as Old Sarum, Ogbury Hillfort, and Salisbury Cathedral amongst other monuments, and potentially also the Stonehenge World Heritage Site, will be an important factor and possible constraint. The potential for as yet unidentified buried remains of importance, and potentially of national significance, is high. Until the land has been subject to assessment and evaluation, the full extent of archaeological constraints cannot be determined. The resource and time required to undertake appropriate assessment and evaluation should not be underestimated. Wiltshire's Historic Landscape Character Assessment shows that the current field pattern is largely of 18th- and 19th-century date and not of significant heritage value.

**Durrington:** Significant development could impact on the setting of the historic core conservation area. Coalescence with neighbouring settlements, including Larkhill, could compromise their separate character/identities.

**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/	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
-------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Area			
<b>Amesbury</b>	<p>In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival.</p> <p>Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day.</p> <p>With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from the proposed 1425 dwellings.</p>	<p>Level of growth is much lower in this strategy, and minor adverse effects are considered likely overall. There are considered to be sufficient areas where development of 630 dwellings could take place without having significant impacts on heritage assets.</p>	<p>In addition to the World Heritage Site to the west, numerous individual SMs surround the town and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival.</p> <p>Boscombe Down (south-east) is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day.</p> <p>With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from the proposed 1365 dwellings.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.</p>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.</p>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Salisbury which could be harmed by development. As no locations for development are known at this stage, the scale of growth for all strategies is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.</p>	<p>Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. Nonetheless, minor adverse effects likely through this level of growth.</p>	<p>Tidworth is less constrained in heritage terms and new development is likely to be able to be accommodated without significant effects. Ludgershall is subject to a historic core and several heritage assets including Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. As this strategy proposes a significantly higher level of growth across the two towns the scope for significant effects on heritage assets at Ludgershall increases. Moderate adverse effects are therefore likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Wilton, however these are mainly concentrated to the south/south-west. Nonetheless, the setting of these could be subject to harm as a result of development in any part of the town. Opportunities for avoidance of harm or mitigation are unclear. However, the scale of growth proposed by this strategy suggests a minor adverse effect is likely.</p>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Wilton, however these are mainly concentrated to the south/south-west. The setting of these could be subject to harm as a result of development in any part of the town. This strategy proposes a much lower amount of growth for Wilton and therefore it is more likely that this can be met without having significant impacts.</p> <p>Overall, minor effects are considered likely against this objective.</p>	<p>There are a significant number of heritage designations around Wilton, however these are mainly concentrated to the south/south-west. The setting of these could be subject to harm as a result of development in any part of the town. This strategy proposes a much lower amount of growth for Wilton and therefore it is more likely that this can be met without having significant impacts.</p> <p>Overall, minor effects are considered likely against this objective.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. It is very possible that delivery of this requirement could avoid significant adverse effects on heritage assets. The geographic area of the HMA is large and there are many varied sites available. At this stage, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. It is very possible that delivery of this requirement could avoid significant adverse effects on heritage assets. The geographic area of the HMA is large and there are many varied sites available. At this stage, minor adverse effects are considered likely.	The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. It is very possible that delivery of this requirement could avoid significant adverse effects on heritage assets. The geographic area of the HMA is large and there are many varied sites available. At this stage, minor adverse effects are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	Well-contained development may be able to avoid adverse impacts on heritage assets. However, there is high potential for as yet unidentified buried remains of local and/or national importance in this area. Until the land has been subject to assessment and evaluation, the full extent of archaeological constraints cannot be determined. The site's prominent location within the landscape also means there is potential to affect the settings of nationally important monuments such as Old Sarum, Ogbury Hillfort, Salisbury Cathedral and the Stonehenge World Heritage Site. Overall, moderate adverse effects considered likely.	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	Well-contained development may be able to avoid adverse impacts on heritage assets. However, there is high potential for as yet unidentified buried remains of local and/or national importance in this area. Until the land has been subject to assessment and evaluation, the full extent of archaeological constraints cannot be determined. The site's prominent location within the landscape also means there is potential to affect the settings of nationally important monuments such as Old Sarum, Ogbury Hillfort, Salisbury Cathedral and the Stonehenge World Heritage Site. Overall, moderate adverse effects considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	The new settlement would be a significant sized development. Depending on the location, it may be possible to avoid significant effects on heritage assets. However, the Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including the WHS to the west. In addition to the WHS, numerous individual Scheduled Monuments are in this area and contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. Amesbury Down and Earl's Farm Down are noted areas of evidence survival and Boscombe Down is an important military installation from WWI through to the Cold War and present day. Until the land has been subject to assessment and evaluation, the full extent of archaeological constraints cannot be determined. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from the proposed new settlement.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>

<b>Durrington</b>	Significant development could impact on the setting of the historic core conservation area. Coalescence with neighbouring settlements, including Larkhill, could compromise their separate character/identities. However, the proposed level of growth is expected to be accommodated without significant adverse effects. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 6</b>	<b>-1.4 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.3 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.7 Moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-F is considered the most sustainable strategy against this objective. SA-G is the least sustainable.**
- Given the number and importance of heritage designations around Salisbury and Amesbury, all of the strategies, except SA-F at Amesbury, are considered likely to have significant adverse effects in those settlements given the scale of growth proposed
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is considered less constrained for new development in heritage terms but where SA-G proposes a significantly higher level of growth across the two towns, the scope for significant effects on heritage assets at Ludgershall increases
- There are a significant number of heritage designations around Wilton, however these are mainly concentrated to the south/south-west. The scale of growth proposed by all three strategies suggests minor adverse effects are likely overall
- The proposed quantum of development is similar in the Rest of HMA for each strategy. It is very possible that delivery could avoid significant adverse effects on heritage assets. The geographic area of the HMA is large and there are many varied sites available. At this stage, minor adverse effects are considered likely
- In the High Post area, well-contained development should be able to avoid adverse impacts on heritage assets. But without knowing more details of location, site design and layout etc, it is possible there could be some harm to heritage assets
- For a new settlement in the Boscombe Down/Porton area, there would be a number of considerations as to its location. The Porton/Boscombe Down area is archaeologically important and there are a number of heritage designations, including the WHS to the west. In addition to the WHS, numerous individual Scheduled Monuments contribute to an area of overall high archaeological potential. With this and designated and non-designated assets borne in mind, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from any proposed new settlement
- At Durrington, the proposed level of growth is expected to be accommodated without significant adverse effects

**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. At this stage it is important to note the following at the settlements:

**Salisbury:** the settlement is surrounded by valued landscapes including Cranborne Chase AONB to the south-west. Development locations would need to be selected with diligence and have regard to the setting of the AONB.

**Amesbury:** adverse impacts could occur against important landscape features including the setting of the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) and Amesbury Abbey and Park, which lie to the town's immediate west.



**Tidworth/Ludgershall:** Ludgershall is located in the north-east of Salisbury Plain. It is in an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed and sensitive to large-scale development. The town is within the immediate setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB, approximately 500m to the north. The setting of Ludgershall Castle and Cross SAM should also be considered. The area around Tidworth is enclosed by woods and copses in contrast to the open downland landscape of Salisbury Plain to the north and west of the town.

**Wilton:** a highly sensitive settlement setting with Wilton House registered Park and Gardens to the east, Cranbourne Chase AONB to the west and the floodplains associated with the confluence of the Rivers Wylye and Nadder.

**High Post:** the area is in an elevated position making new development potentially visible from/to neighbouring character areas. Typically, the local settlement pattern is along the river valley corridors where it is concealed by topography and riparian vegetation/trees. New villages in these elevated locations would be at odds with the local landscape character. There is potential for development at High Post to impact on the settings of Old Sarum.

**Boscombe/Porton New Settlement:** the area is in an elevated position making new development potentially visible from/to neighbouring character areas. Typically, the local settlement pattern is along the river valley corridors where it is concealed by topography and riparian vegetation/trees. New villages in these elevated locations would be at odds with the local landscape character. There is potential for development at Boscombe to impact on the settings of the WHS.

**Durrington:** the area is profoundly rich in historical and archaeological features including the WHS to the south-west. The ecologically rich open rolling landscape of Salisbury Plain lies to the north of the settlement.

**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 SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	The western parts of the town are more sensitive and in closer proximity to the WHS and Amesbury Abbey and Park. However, it is considered that there are sufficient areas available for development that would not have significant adverse landscape impacts, therefore this strategy is considered likely to have minor effects against this objective.	The western parts of the town are more sensitive and in closer proximity to the WHS and Amesbury Abbey and Park. However, it is considered that there are sufficient areas available for development that would not have significant adverse landscape impacts, therefore this strategy is considered likely to have minor effects against this objective.	The western parts of the town are more sensitive and in closer proximity to the WHS and Amesbury Abbey and Park. However, it is considered that there are sufficient areas available for development that would not have significant adverse landscape impacts, therefore this strategy is considered likely to have minor effects against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on the location of new development. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on the location of new development. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.	All strategies propose a significant level of growth at Salisbury. There is potential for significant adverse landscape effects and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on the location of new development. At this strategic stage of the assessment, until more detail is available of specific locations, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategy distributions.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity, to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is considered that new	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, it is	Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. As this strategy proposes a much higher level of growth, the

	development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	considered that new development on this scale could take place without significant effects.	scope for significant effects increases. Therefore, moderate adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	Wilton is surrounded by valued landscapes, including the Cranborne Chase AONB to the west of the town and Wilton House. The higher quantum of development proposed under this scenario would be more difficult to accommodate and therefore moderate adverse effects are likely.	The significantly lower quantum of development proposed under this scenario would be easier to accommodate and therefore minor adverse effects are likely.	The significantly lower quantum of development proposed under this scenario would be easier to accommodate and therefore minor adverse effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by two AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, and a range of local and historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. However, there are also large areas that are not within any specific landscape designation. It may be possible to accommodate the proposed growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by two AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, and a range of local and historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. However, there are also large areas that are not within any specific landscape designation. It may be possible to accommodate the proposed growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.	The rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by two AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas and a range of local and historic settings which could be adversely affected by new development. However, there are also large areas that are not within any specific landscape designation. It may be possible to accommodate the proposed growth without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	The High Post area of search is set within an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed and sensitive to large-scale development. The Cranborne Chase AONB lies approximately 7km to the west. There is a risk of any development at High Post coalescing with Old Sarum which itself is at risk of coalescing with Salisbury. In terms of its location on high ground, it will be prominent in the Special Landscape Area (especially from Old Sarum castle) and there is a heritage issue in terms of protecting the castles' setting and that of the World Heritage Site (WHS). The area of search at High Post is located in the rural area beyond the landscape setting of Amesbury therefore proposals for development should address the management strategy and objectives as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment. This scale of development is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects overall against this objective.	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	The High Post area of search is set within an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed and sensitive to large-scale development. The Cranborne Chase AONB lies approximately 7km to the west. There is a risk of any development at High Post coalescing with Old Sarum which itself is at risk of coalescing with Salisbury. In terms of its location on high ground, it will be prominent in the Special Landscape Area (especially from Old Sarum castle) and there is a heritage issue in terms of protecting the castles' setting and that of the World Heritage Site (WHS). The area of search at High Post is located in the rural area beyond the landscape setting of Amesbury therefore proposals for development should address the management strategy and objectives as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment. This scale of development is considered likely to have moderate adverse effects overall against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>

<b>Boscombe/ Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	It is likely that a new settlement of this scale in the Porton/Boscombe Down area could have significant landscape impacts. There is the potential to adversely affect the World Heritage Site (Stonehenge component) and its 'outstanding universal value' through factors that include inter alia light pollution. Development on the upper slopes of the chalk landscape would be highly visible. The area south-east of Amesbury occupies and is surrounded by a special landscape area (Salisbury SLA). These factors combine to suggest likely significant adverse effects. However, depending on location, it is considered that landscape-scale mitigation would be feasible, indicating moderate adverse effects for a new community overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	Durrington lies in close proximity to a number of very important landscapes which will all require consideration. However, it is considered that the modest scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having significant effects on this objective.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 7</b>	<b>-1.6 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>	<b>-1.7 Moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-F is considered the most sustainable strategy against this objective**, although scores for each strategy are very similar. **SA-G is the least sustainable.**
- At Amesbury, it is considered that there are sufficient areas available for development for each strategy where significant adverse landscape impacts could be avoided, therefore all strategies are considered likely to have minor effects against this objective
- It is considered that the level of growth proposed in all strategies for Salisbury is likely to have significant adverse effects. There is potential for significant impacts and harm to key views to/from Salisbury Cathedral and Old Sarum, depending on where new development is located. There are also a number of village conservation areas outside the city that could be harmed
- Ludgershall is sensitive to large-scale development and the North Wessex Downs AONB lies in close proximity to the north. At Tidworth, the downland landscape of Salisbury Plain would require consideration. However, strategy SA-G, that proposes a much higher level of growth, is the only strategy considered likely to have significant effects
- Wilton is surrounded by valued landscapes, including the Cranborne Chase AONB to the west of the town and Wilton House. The higher quantum of development proposed under Strategy SA-E would be more difficult to accommodate and therefore significant adverse effects are likely
- It may be possible to accommodate the proposed growth in the Rest of the HMA without likely significant effects, but further knowledge of locations would be required because the rural parts of the HMA are affected variously by AONB designations, Special Landscape Areas, the New Forest National Park and a range of local and historic settings. At this strategic level, moderate adverse effects are considered likely for all strategies
- The High Post area of search is set within an open, arable landscape that is visually exposed but it is not within any national landscape designation. This scale of development is considered likely to have minor adverse effects overall against this objective

- It is likely that a new settlement of this scale in the Porton/Boscombe Down area could have significant landscape impacts. The various factors outlined above combine to suggest likely significant adverse effects. Development on this scale could also offer opportunities for landscape-scale mitigation such as Green Infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement and it is suggested that the new settlement location be the subject of further analysis to assess whether it could be sensitively designed without detriment to surrounding landscapes and assets
- It is considered that the modest scale of development proposed at Durrington could be accommodated without having significant effects on 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 Question (DAQ) 1: Provide an adequate supply of affordable housing?**

Delivery of housing in **Salisbury** has been below planned rates, mainly due to delays in strategic allocations coming forward for development. 23% of homes built at Salisbury since the WCS was adopted have been affordable homes. This is against a target of 40%. Using a 2018 dataset, the house price to earnings ratio for Salisbury is 7.83.

Similarly, **Wilton** has been subject to lower rates of affordable housing delivery, with a boost in affordable supply in 2016. Using a 2018 dataset, the housing price to earnings ratio is 8.97.

At **Amesbury and Durrington** rates of delivery have been very good over the last 5 years and the overall WCS requirement could potentially be met ahead of 2026. However, the rates of affordable housing delivery are around 16% since the WCS was adopted, against a requirement of 30%. There was a boost in supply of affordable housing in 2021, with 44% affordable housing delivered. This is the only year in the WCS plan period to exceed the 30% requirement. Using a 2018 dataset, the housing price to earnings ratio is 7.15.

Housing delivery at **Tidworth and Ludgershall** has exceeded planned rates since the adoption of the WCS and it is highly likely that the full housing requirement will be met within the WCS plan period. Despite this, rates of affordable housing delivery have been around 16% since the adopted of the WCS, against a target of 30%. The 30% target was exceeded in 2018, but other years have fallen short of the target by a large proportion. Using a 2018 dataset, the housing price to earnings ratio is 7.72.

For the **Rest of the HMA** (the rural area) homes have been delivered at or above expected levels with the exception of the Tisbury area which has experienced below planned levels of development. Affordability ratios are, however, higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years.

The updated housing requirement means that growth for the HMA will be lower (by approximately 1,350 homes) than the number of homes allocated for 2006 – 2026 under the WCS. Approximately 54% of this proposed housing requirement for the Salisbury HMA is already committed. The residual 4,995 homes are unlikely to make a good contribution to the provision of affordable homes in the HMA up to the end of the plan period.

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.

**High Post** is not subject to any past housing deliver rates.

**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 SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under this strategy is 1,425 dwellings. Taking into account existing commitments, this leaves a residual requirement of 1,075 dwellings (as of January 2022).</p> <p>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 Amesbury and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to significantly increasing the requirement at Amesbury which would have greater benefits against this objective.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under this Strategy is 630 dwellings. Taking into account existing commitments, there would be a residual requirement of just 280 dwellings (as of January 2022). for the whole plan period, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period, although the extent that this would happen is uncertain. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Amesbury and on the provision of a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.</p> <p>However, this scenario does include the provision of a new community of 2,165 dwellings in the Porton/ Boscombe Down area, which could be close to Amesbury. If this is the case, the scale of growth under this strategy may have a positive effect on the supply of affordable homes for Amesbury in the longer term. But due to the lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period. If the new community is located away from Amesbury, effects would be dependent on the types of employment and jobs that will be provided at this location as part of the wider development of the area. For this reason, the effects are predicted as minor positive for Amesbury overall.</p>	<p>The housing requirement for Amesbury under this strategy is 1,365 dwellings. Taking into account existing commitments, this leaves a residual requirement of 1,015 dwellings (as of January 2022) which is similar to Strategy SA-E.</p> <p>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 Amesbury and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs. Consideration could be given to significantly increasing the requirement at Amesbury which would have greater benefits against this objective.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is 4,400 dwellings. However, existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of this, leaving a residual of 1,420 dwellings (as of January 2022). It is considered that the scale of growth proposed under this strategy would be likely to have significant benefits for the supply of affordable homes in Salisbury and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.</p>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is 4,540 dwellings which is not dissimilar to SA-E. Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of this, leaving a residual of 1,560 dwellings (as of January 2022).</p> <p>It is considered that the scale of growth proposed under this strategy would be likely to have significant benefits for the supply of affordable homes in Salisbury and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.</p>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is 4,375 dwellings which is not dissimilar to SA-E and SA-F. Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of this, leaving a residual of 1,395 dwellings (as of January 2022).</p> <p>It is considered that the scale of growth proposed under this strategy would be likely to have significant benefits for the supply of affordable homes in Salisbury and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is 1,520 dwellings. However, existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of this, leaving a residual of 685 dwellings (as of January 2022).</p>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is 1,140 dwellings which is the lowest of the three. Existing commitments would deliver a significant proportion of this, leaving a residual of just 305</p>	<p>The proposed housing requirement under this strategy is the highest at 1,940 dwellings. Existing commitments would deliver a proportion of this, leaving a residual of 1,105 dwellings (as of January 2022).</p>

	It is considered that the scale of growth proposed under this strategy would be likely to have some benefits for the supply of affordable homes in Tidworth and Ludgershall and could provide a range of house types and sizes to meet different needs.	dwellings (as of January 2022) for the whole plan period, meaning that there is a risk of a hiatus in housing delivery in the latter part of the plan period. It is considered that the scale of growth under this strategy would be likely to have a minor negative effect on the supply of market and affordable homes for Tidworth and Ludgershall.	It is considered that the scale of growth proposed under this strategy would be likely to have moderate benefits for the supply of market and affordable homes in Tidworth and Ludgershall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	The proposed housing requirement for this strategy for Wilton is 345 with a residual figure of 210 (as of January 2022). This is lower than the proposed 400 dwellings in the LPR Empowering Rural Communities document but is still expected to have some benefits for the delivery of affordable housing in Wilton. However, greater benefits would arise and current affordability issues in this area eased somewhat if a much greater requirement was allocated.	The much lower housing requirement proposed of 145 dwellings for this strategy and SA-G would leave a residual requirement of just 5 (as of January 2022). This would mean a virtual hiatus in plan-led housing delivery for the whole plan period which would have a significantly negative effect on affordability in this area and on the local housing market and economy. This could be remedied through another plan-led route eg if housing allocations were made in a neighbourhood plan, but this has no certainty. It is recognised that the residual amount of 0 is because of development already in the pipeline, but the scale of growth proposed under this strategy is considered to be low and would be likely to have negative effects on the supply of affordable homes and other house types and tenures at Wilton, where affordability is poor.	The much lower housing requirement proposed of 145 dwellings for this strategy and SA-G would leave a residual requirement of just 5 (as of January 2022). This would mean a virtual hiatus in plan-led housing delivery for the whole plan period which would have a significantly negative effect on affordability in this area and on the local housing market and economy. This could be remedied through another plan-led route eg if housing allocations were made in a neighbourhood plan, but this has no certainty. It is recognised that the residual amount of 0 is because of development already in the pipeline, but the scale of growth proposed under this strategy is considered to be low and would be likely to have negative effects on the supply of affordable homes and other house types and tenures at Wilton, where affordability is poor.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The housing requirements in these 3 strategies are all very similar. Affordability ratios are higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years. A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in the rural parts of the HMA with many people just not able to afford to live in rural areas. The residual requirement for this strategy would be just 1,305 dwellings (as of January 2022) over the plan period. The delivery of affordable housing in villages is likely to be limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance are likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	The housing requirements in these 3 strategies are all very similar. Affordability ratios are higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years. A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in the rural parts of the HMA with many people just not able to afford to live in rural areas. The residual requirement for this strategy would be just 1,390 dwellings (as of January 2022) over the plan period. The delivery of affordable housing in villages is likely to be limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance are likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.	The housing requirements in these 3 strategies are all very similar. Affordability ratios are higher in rural areas, which reflects the limited supply of homes at large and small villages in recent years. A continuation of relatively low levels of housing growth at small and large villages is likely to exacerbate affordability issues in the rural parts of the HMA with many people just not able to afford to live in rural areas. The residual requirement for this strategy would be just 1,390 dwellings (as of January 2022) over the plan period. The delivery of affordable housing in villages is likely to be limited by appropriate site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes is likely to be small. These factors on balance are likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the supply of affordable homes in the rest of the HMA.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>High Post New Village</b>	The housing requirement proposed of 800 dwellings is likely to be able to deliver a significant amount of affordable housing and a range of different sizes, types and tenures to meet different sectors of the community. Overall, moderate benefits are likely against this objective.	No housing is proposed in this strategy for High Post. Housing is instead proposed at other locations. Neutral effects are considered likely.	The housing requirement proposed of 800 dwellings is likely to be able to deliver a significant amount of affordable housing and a range of different sizes, types and tenures to meet different sectors of the community. Overall, moderate benefits are likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing proposed for a new settlement at Boscombe/Porton in this strategy. Housing is instead proposed at other locations. Therefore, neutral effects overall.	This strategy proposes 2,165 dwellings at a new settlement in the Boscombe/Porton area which is considered likely to have significant benefits for the chosen location, against this objective. It is considered that the scale of growth would be likely to have significant benefits for the supply of affordable homes in the HMA in the longer term and could also benefit Amesbury which sees a significant drop in its requirement in this strategy. It is also likely to include a wide range of different housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local housing needs. However, due to the substantial likely lead time required to establish growth of this scale and form, it is unlikely to deliver until later in the plan period. Therefore, moderate positive overall.	There is no housing proposed for a new settlement at Boscombe/Porton in this strategy. Housing is instead proposed at other locations. Therefore, neutral effects overall.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	The housing requirement for this strategy is 215 with a residual figure of 215 (as of January 2022). This is higher than the proposed 85 dwellings in the LPR Empowering Rural Communities document. The delivery of affordable housing in Durrington is likely to be limited by site size and therefore the quantity of new affordable homes could be affected by this. The proposed level of housing in Durrington is likely to have minor benefits overall.	There is no housing requirement proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely against this objective.	There is no housing requirement proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 8</b>	<b>1.1 Minor positive</b>	<b>0.3 Minor positive</b>	<b>1.0 Minor positive</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategy SA-E is the most sustainable strategy** against this objective. **Strategy SA-G is slightly less sustainable, while SA-F is considered the least sustainable strategy**
- In SA-F, much of the housing provision is located in just two settlements – Salisbury and Boscombe/Porton new settlement. The social and economic benefits arising from housing provision are reduced at Amesbury, Tidworth/Ludgershall and Wilton because of the lower numbers proposed and potential for housing delivery to stagnate during the plan period. And the numbers proposed in the rural part of the HMA are considered likely to exacerbate affordability issues

- Benefits of new housing are expected as a result of all strategies. The continued supply of housing, albeit over a slightly different housing market geography, is expected to deliver a range of new house types and sizes to meet a range of needs, as well as help the affordability of housing and supply of affordable housing tenures. Therefore, all strategies are assessed as having positive effects
- The total number of homes being planned for in each ADS is also the same for each scenario, meaning that the difference in effects between them will not be vast
- The percentage of affordable homes delivered against the current plan requirement has been below target levels, the housing requirement for this HMA against the next plan period is therefore unlikely to address any shortfall in provision of affordable homes. This is primarily because existing commitments are likely to be built out before the end of the plan period, potentially creating a slowdown in housing construction (and provision of affordable homes) in the HMA during the latter half of the plan period
- A rural facilities survey should be undertaken to identify where the provision of homes in rural areas 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?**

**Salisbury** is subject to areas of high deprivation, with 12% of the local population living in the most deprived areas. Salisbury is the only settlement in the HMA that is subject to areas with the highest deprivation scores. In contrast, 0% of the population in **Tidworth/Ludgershall, Amesbury, Durrington** and **Wilton** live in a most deprived area. **High Post** is subject to two large Lower-layer Super Output Areas. One of which is subjects to higher levels of deprivation, while the other is subject to very low levels.

**Salisbury** has 11.3% of 20 year olds living in poverty. This is higher than the Wiltshire average of 9.4%, with these rates being lower than the average at other settlements in the HMA. Additionally, a higher than Wiltshire average proportion of under 18 year olds in **Salisbury** are supported by social care.

Older people in **Salisbury, Wilton, Tidworth/Ludgershall, Amesbury** and **Durrington** are more at risk of social isolation than Wiltshire as a whole.

The **Rest of the HMA** tends to be subject to lower rates of social care among under 18s and poverty among under 20s. Except in Mere, where these rates surpass the Wiltshire average.

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

**Amesbury** is served by the Sarum North Primary Care Network. There are 3 GP surgeries serving this area. Two of these are subject to no particular capacity issues, however St Melor House is subject to capacity issues with a shortfall of -94m<sup>2</sup>. However, the health centre site is not considered fit for purpose.

At **Amesbury**, Stonehenge School and Avon Valley College have been expanded to meet known demand for school places in the area. Despite expansion, Stonehenge School is expected to be full by 2024/25. The school site is very constrained and could only support the creation of 150 additional places which limits new housing to 600 units in Amesbury. Substantial levels of development (around 7,000 new homes) would be able to support a new secondary school in the area. The needs of up to 1,000 homes in Durrington could be accommodated at Avon Valley College and additional expansion could be an opportunity. A new primary school in Amesbury has opened which could be expanded if necessary. There are also some surplus places in the existing primary schools. Up to 1000 new houses could therefore be accommodated at primary level in Amesbury.

At early years level the existing provision is full. Therefore, any housing will require new nursery places. This could be provided through possible expansion of an existing setting if the number of houses is below 250. However, if there are more houses a new nursery would be the preferred option. This would be preferably within walking distance of the new housing. Land and contributions would be required.

At **Salisbury** there is capacity identified across the secondary schools and some surplus capacity among primary schools. A new primary school has been secured, in addition, in supply of places forecast from 2024 onwards as planned expansion will meet known demand. There are some surplus places in primary schools but the proposed level of new housing would fill these and require additional new places. New primary school sites have been secured in Netherhampton and at Longhedge which could be built as larger schools to provide these places, assuming that the housing is the vicinity. The Longhedge school would need to be brought forward within the next 6 years as that is when the site would need to be returned to the developer if not used. It is not currently required for existing demand. If the housing is elsewhere, then a new 2FE primary school site would be required for a new primary school. At least 2 new nurseries would be required on new housing sites to



create the additional early years places required in Salisbury. Land and contributions would be required for this. At secondary level, there is no provision in Wilton or High Post so any housing in these areas would also need to feed into Salisbury secondary provision. The existing schools will fill over the next few years and therefore new places will be needed to support any further new housing. There is capacity to expand Sarum Academy and potentially the 3 secondary schools on the Laverstock campus. Insufficient homes are proposed to make a whole new school viable as this would require approx. 7000 homes.

Within **Wilton** there is only one primary school which cannot be further expanded. This school has some surplus places but these will largely be filled by current housing. It might be possible to meet the needs of less than 100 new houses but no more than this. There are existing nurseries in Wilton but these would not be able to accommodate the children generated by 190 new houses. Nor would this create sufficient numbers to support a new nursery. At secondary level there is no provision in Wilton so pupils would need to travel into Salisbury.

Health centres are located within both **Salisbury** and **Wilton**, providing a range of services. These are branch surgeries of the main practice. The closure of one of these in 2020 has caused issues, with capacity across the Primary Care Networks serving the area. These gaps are significant at some of the branch surgeries. Gaps within the Primary Care Networks range from -312m<sup>2</sup> – 479m<sup>2</sup>. There are plans to extend the hospital on the current site, which will help to address some capacity issues with some services expanded outside of the city too.

At **Tidworth/Ludgershall** planning school places in a town with a significant military population is challenging and pupil numbers can vary significantly from one year to the next as regiments move in and out. It is necessary to have at least 5% surplus places to accommodate fluctuations in demand. Wellington Academy, which serves **Tidworth/Ludgershall** has been expanded to meet the needs of demand of army basing and new civilian housing in the area. There is a risk that school could become very large. Higher levels of growth (around 4500 new homes) are likely to be able to support new provision. New primary provision has recently been built which will fill from current housing in Ludgershall. There are some surplus places in Tidworth and Ludgershall Castle Primary school plus scope for a small amount of expansion at Clarendon Infant and Junior Schools. Beyond this, there is no opportunity to expand existing primary provision. As a result, growth of up to 600 homes could be accommodated in existing provision and by expansion of Clarendon Infants and Junior. Higher levels of housing would require new primary provision. Existing early years provision is either full or nearing capacity. Any housing growth will require the creation of new early years places either through the creation of new settings or by expanding existing ones. There will be a limit to how much existing settings can expand and therefore with increased housing numbers a site will be required for a large new setting.

**Tidworth/Ludgershall** is also served by the Sarum North Primary Care Network. This consists of 3 GP surgeries. Two of these are subject to no particular capacity issues, however St Melor House is subject to capacity issues with a shortfall of -94m<sup>2</sup>. However, the health centre site is not considered fit for purpose.

A **Boscombe/Porton new community** would need new early years, primary and secondary provision. At early years level, 2165 dwellings would require approx. 281 early years places which would need to be provided in new settings with a maximum of 100 children in each. At primary level a new 3FE primary school would be required. Some of the early years provision could be located with this new school. At secondary level a standalone new school for the 450 pupils generated by 2165 new homes would not be viable, but this would be too many to transport into Salisbury daily nor would the Salisbury schools be capable of expanding by this much (in addition to the housing proposed for Salisbury itself). There are various options for dealing with this, it might be possible to create a satellite of an existing school or create an all through 4-16 school for both primary and secondary pupils. Housing in this area in the long-term (into the following plan periods) could reach 10,000 homes, at which point a standalone secondary school would be viable.

At **High Post new village** there are very few places available at the local primary schools and neither would be a safe walking route from new housing at High Post. Therefore, a new 1FE primary school would be required. This is not ideal as all new schools should be larger than this to have long term viability. A new 100 place nursery would also be required, this could be co-located with the primary school or on a nearby site. Land and contributions would be required for both. Only 800 homes would not make secondary school provision viable, therefore secondary age children would need to travel into Salisbury where new places would need to be created for them (please see Salisbury comments above). There would be significant transport costs associated with this that Wiltshire Council would need to fund.

At **Durrington** there are surplus places in the secondary school which would support up to 1000 new dwellings. There are also some surplus places in the infants and junior schools which would support up to 200 houses. For early years, there are limited spaces available in the local nurseries. Small expansion of an existing provision might be possible. Insufficient new homes are proposed to make a new provision necessary or viable.

In the **Rest of the HMA**, Downton and Whiteparish are currently subject to a gap in GP provision (-367m<sup>2</sup>). This is not forecast to change by 2026. In total, 995 new dwellings (residual requirement) would require 129 new early years places, 308 primary and 219 secondary places which are significant numbers of pupils, as the location of these new dwellings is not yet known the extent of any effects is unclear.

**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 focusing development in the Rest of HMA areas without promoting services alongside could lead to more isolation.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	<p>Strategy SA-E proposes 1,425 dwellings at Amesbury (residual housing requirement of 1,075 dwellings as of January 2022) and 2.5ha employment. This level of growth may place some additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and secondary education facilities in the town. The residual requirement under this strategy would be over and above the limit of 600 homes that could be absorbed by the town’s secondary school provision, which would be difficult to mitigate. However, this strategy also has benefits in terms of provision of jobs, affordable housing, new or expanded 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 give rise to both positive and negative effects in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities.</p> <p>Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from this level of growth, with the key constraint being that of secondary education capacity.</p>	<p>Strategy SA-F proposes 1ha of employment and 630 dwellings (residual housing requirement of just 280 dwellings as of January 2022) for the whole plan period, which would be likely to have a negative effect on the supply of affordable homes for Amesbury. It is the provision of a wide range of housing types and tenures, alongside new jobs, which is most likely to increase social inclusion and help reduce deprivation and this strategy is unlikely to significantly resolve these issues. However, this strategy is also unlikely to place significant additional pressure on existing services and facilities as it proposes a much lower level of housing and employment.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. The residual requirement for homes could be accommodated by existing secondary school capacity. Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely</p>	<p>Strategy SA-G proposes 1,365 dwellings at Amesbury (residual housing requirement of 1,015 dwellings as of January 2022) and 2.5ha employment. This level of growth may place some additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health secondary education facilities in the town. The residual requirement under this strategy would be over and above the limit of 600 homes that could be absorbed by the town’s secondary school provision, which would be difficult to mitigate. However, this strategy also has benefits in terms of provision of jobs, affordable housing, new or expanded facilities, and creation of new areas of public open space that could help reduce social isolation and allow physical exercise.</p> <p>New development is considered likely to give rise to both positive and negative effects in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered likely from this level of growth, with the key constraint being that of secondary education capacity.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury (4400 dwellings) is lower than the current WCS requirement. This strategy includes 7.5ha employment. The residual housing requirement is 1,420 dwellings as of January 2022. This level of growth may place additional pressure on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the City. However, it could also have benefits in terms of provision of jobs, affordable housing and new/or expanded facilities. And creation of new areas of</p>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury (4540 dwellings) is lower than the current WCS requirement. This strategy includes 8ha employment. The residual housing requirement is 1,560 dwellings as of January 2022. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it could also have benefits in terms of provision of jobs, affordable housing and new/or expanded facilities. And creation of new areas of</p>	<p>This level of housing growth at Salisbury (4375 dwellings) is lower than the current WCS requirement. This strategy includes 7.5ha employment. The residual housing requirement is 1,395 dwellings as of January 2022. This level of growth may place additional pressures on existing services and facilities – there is currently significant pressure on health and education facilities in the city. However, it could also have benefits in terms of provision of jobs, affordable housing and new/or expanded facilities.</p>

	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, deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Because this strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the WCS, minor benefits are considered likely.	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, deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Because this strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the WCS, minor benefits are considered likely.	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, deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Because this strategy proposes a lower level of growth than the WCS, minor benefits are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This strategy proposes 1,520 dwellings (residual housing requirement of 685 dwellings as of January 2022) and 2.5ha employment. While education services in this area are facing pressure, development is likely to be positive overall. Nonetheless, there may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities as a result of new housing. New development to provide jobs and affordable homes is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. This level of growth is likely to have minor benefits overall.	This strategy proposes 1,140 dwellings (residual housing requirement of just 305 dwellings as of January 2022) and 2ha employment. While education services in this area are facing pressure, development is likely to be positive overall. Nonetheless, there may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities as a result of new housing. New development to provide jobs and affordable homes is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more resilient communities. This level of growth is likely to have minor benefits overall.	SA-G proposes a higher scale of growth at Tidworth and Ludgershall - 1,940 dwellings (residual housing requirement of 1,105 dwellings as of January 2022) and 3.5ha employment. Development is likely to be positive overall although there may be some short-term pressure on services and facilities, such as local schools, which are currently facing pressure. But, there is the potential for enhanced long-term gain through more investment in these. New development is considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities. Moderate benefits are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	This strategy proposes 345 dwellings (residual housing requirement of 210 as of January 2022) and 1ha employment. Wilton is subject to similar issues to Salisbury. This level of growth could place some additional pressure on local services and facilities but is considered to have benefits of new affordable housing and may lead to expanded or enhanced facilities. There is potential for longer terms gains as a result and a minor positive effect is considered likely.	This strategy proposes 145 dwellings (residual housing requirement of 5 as of January 2022) and 1ha employment. Wilton is subject to similar issues to Salisbury. Additional employment land is likely to have benefits of new jobs, but is balanced out by the lack of new housing to support more affordable homes, services and facilities. This level of growth is considered likely to have neutral effects overall against this objective.	This strategy proposes 145 dwellings (residual housing requirement of 5 as of January 2022) and 1ha employment. Wilton is subject to similar issues to Salisbury. Additional employment land is likely to have benefits of new jobs, but is balanced out by the lack of new housing to support more affordable homes, services and facilities. This level of growth is considered likely to have neutral effects overall against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	All three strategies propose a similar level of housing in the rural parts of the HMA. This strategy proposes 2005 dwellings (residual requirement of 1,305 homes as of January 2022) across the whole area and 13ha employment. New housing and employment development are considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities in rural areas, and for there to be meaningful change, significantly higher housing requirements should be proposed. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services.	All three strategies propose a similar level of housing in the rural parts of the HMA. This strategy proposes 2090 dwellings (residual requirement of 1,390 homes as of January 2022) across the whole area and 13ha employment. New housing and employment development are considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities in rural areas, and for there to be meaningful change, significantly higher housing requirements should be proposed. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services. This level of growth	All three strategies propose a similar level of housing in the rural parts of the HMA. This strategy proposes 2090 dwellings (residual requirement of 1,390 homes as of January 2022) across the whole area and 13ha employment. New housing and employment development are considered likely to be more positive than negative in terms of reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities in rural areas, and for there to be meaningful change, significantly higher housing requirements should be proposed. Some services and facilities in the rural areas are under pressure, especially GP and public transport services. This level of growth proposed is not likely to add

	<p>This level of growth proposed is not likely to add significantly to this but will not greatly support other services such as village shops, pubs and primary schools. Overall, the location of development remains uncertain, and this strategy is considered likely to have neutral effects against this objective.</p>	<p>proposed is not likely to add significantly to this but will not greatly support other services such as village shops, pubs and primary schools. Overall, the location of development remains uncertain, and this strategy is considered likely to have neutral effects against this objective.</p>	<p>significantly to this but will not greatly support other services such as village shops, pubs and primary schools. Overall, the location of development remains uncertain, and this strategy is considered likely to have neutral effects against this objective.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	<p>800 dwellings and 1.5Ha employment are proposed under this strategy. This is an isolated location (approx. 4.2km from Amesbury and Salisbury) with few services and facilities in the immediate local area. The housing and employment elements are considered positive for helping to provide local people with jobs and a range of housing. However, a new village would require access to a full range of infrastructure to allow a sustainable and inclusive community to develop. The number of homes proposed under this strategy would not be enough to sustain some key infrastructure, such as a secondary school, and therefore some reliance on the services and facilities at other larger settlements would be required. In the case of secondary education pupils would need to travel into Salisbury and there are likely to be significant transport costs associated with this. On the basis of evidence currently available, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.</p>	<p>No development is proposed at High Post under this strategy therefore neutral effects overall.</p>	<p>800 dwellings and 1.5Ha employment are proposed under this strategy. This is an isolated location (approx. 4.2km from Amesbury and Salisbury) with few services and facilities in the immediate local area. The housing and employment elements are considered positive for helping to provide local people with jobs and a range of housing. However, a new village would require access to a full range of infrastructure to allow a sustainable and inclusive community to develop. The number of homes proposed under this strategy would not be enough to sustain some key infrastructure, such as a secondary school, and therefore some reliance on the services and facilities at other larger settlements would be required. In the case of secondary education pupils would need to travel into Salisbury and there are likely to be significant transport costs associated with this. On the basis of evidence currently available, a minor adverse effect is considered likely.</p>
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/Porton New Settlement</b>	<p>There is no new community proposed in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>	<p>This strategy proposes a substantial new community in the Boscombe Down/Porton area of 2,165 homes and 4ha employment. This could benefit both the surrounding rural area and Amesbury as the nearest town through significant provision of affordable housing and other types of housing, new social infrastructure, improved public transport networks, employment, public open space and biodiversity enhancement. As a new community, it would be required to provide access to a full range of infrastructure to allow a sustainable and inclusive community to develop. A new community of this scale (anticipating that further development may take place in the next plan period) is likely to be able to support such infrastructure. Regarding education provision during this plan period, a satellite of an existing school may be needed, or the create an all through 4-16 school for both primary and secondary pupils. Overall,</p>	<p>There is no new community proposed in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.</p>

		moderate positive effects are likely towards the back end of the plan period against this objective.	
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	This strategy proposes a relatively modest level of growth at Durrington of 215 dwellings and 1ha employment. This level of growth is unlikely to place significant pressure on local services and facilities and will have some benefits in terms of housing and employment provision. Minor positive effects are considered likely overall.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 9</b>	<b>0.1 Minor positive</b>	<b>0.8 Minor positive</b>	<b>0 Neutral</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- New development in different parts of the HMA is considered to be positive overall, through provision of jobs; affordable housing; and new or expanded health, education, cultural and recreational 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
- New development can cause pressure on existing services and facilities in the short-term and needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of new residents. This is particularly the case regarding transport, healthcare and education where services are under pressure across much of the area
- All of the strategies scored similarly in the assessment; however, strategy **SA-F is more sustainable** as there is more likelihood of benefits. **Strategy SA-G has marginally less benefits and is considered the least sustainable option**
- Some strategies which direct development towards particular areas e.g. SA-F focusing on a New Settlement at Porton/Boscombe Down, are likely to have more benefits for this location. But strategies SA-E and SA-G propose a spread distribution across several settlements and score better across all of the settlements as a result.
- Strategies SA-E and SE-G are more constrained at Amesbury, due to the limited capacity in secondary education which is not high enough to absorb the residual requirements under these strategies.
- For new development to be effective in reducing poverty and deprivation and promoting more inclusive communities, it will be very important that all new housing development includes a range of house types/tenures and a level of affordable housing that will help reduce the affordability ratio, which is high in this area, and that all new development provides the essential services and facilities that are needed to avoid increasing pressure on existing services and also reduces the need to travel and reduces out-commuting.

**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 this HMA are not universal with the main rail option being present in Salisbury. 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.

1.

**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.

**Amesbury's** highway infrastructure is characterised by the A303 running just to the north of the settlement. This strategic link can suffer from peak time delays which cause rat running, impacting the capacity of Amesbury's transport infrastructure. Further delays also occur on the A345 and London Road. Amesbury does not have a railway station.

**Salisbury** hosts a number of key routes, all passing through or around the centre. These routes, namely the A36, A345 and A30 each suffer from peak time delays at key junctions. This congestion also needs to be considered against its impact on the AQMA present within Salisbury. Rail provision is strong in Salisbury.

The A338 is the primary route running through **Tidworth and Ludgershall** and therefore, with links to the A303, experiences a high volume of HGV traffic. This primary route does have some pinch points further afield which may need to be considered when planning growth, as will the congestion that occurs on this route at peak times. Neither town has a railway station.

**Boscombe/Porton new community** – this area of search has poor existing public transport services but it would be close to an established community, albeit rural. A significant sized new community could attract services, infrastructure and more diverse employment to the area and allow a delivery strategy to be developed that includes safeguarded infrastructure provision. Local bus provision is very poor and there will need to be early uplifts in provision at a cost to the development. There would be possible highway links to the A345 and A338 and possibilities for a future railway station as the railway line passes just to the east of Porton.

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.

2.

**Wilton** – the local highway network is characterised by the A36 running east-west to the north of the settlement. This strategic link can suffer from peak time delays in both directions. Wilton does not have a railway station but does have a Park & Ride with regular services to Salisbury city centre.

**Durrington** - the village has good access onto the A345 where there are regular bus services between north and south Wiltshire and it is in very close proximity to Amesbury and the A303. Durrington does not have a railway station.

**High Post** – Vehicle access can be achieved to the site, however, the existing signals require replacement and enhancement and this may currently be restricted due to lack of available land; this may significantly prejudice the delivery of development. The A345 adjacent presents an adequate high-capacity route, with good connections to the Strategic Road Network in the north (A303) and to the south (A36). The proposed location is poorly served by local amenities, with retail confined to the existing petrol station/Londis and a mix of employment opportunities including Hospitality (Hotel and Golf Club) and business park; these destinations have limited or poorly maintained pedestrian infrastructure. The site is beyond reasonable maximum walking distances to any community facilities, education establishments, food superstore or a more diverse range of employment opportunities.

**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 **Amesbury** is primarily focussed on the A303 running just north of the settlement providing direct links to settlements further afield, including key locations beyond Wiltshire. The A345 offers links to the north and south of the settlement. These highway links provide the basis for bus services to serve the settlement with links to a number of locations within Wiltshire and beyond. Rail provision is not present within Amesbury with the nearest station at Grately (limited services) and Salisbury.

**Salisbury** offers a host of key highway links including the A345, A30 and A36 which forms a ring road around the centre, taking traffic away from this area. Bus services operate to link the suburbs to the centre while park and ride services operate in numerous locations. Other bus routes link Salisbury to several settlements within Wiltshire. Rail provision is strong with the railway station offering a wide variety of direct services.

**Tidworth and Ludgershall's** main highway link is the A338 travelling north/south through the area with the A303 being accessible via this route to the south while the A342 also offers transport options. Bus services utilise these routes to offer public transport provision which is reported to be comparatively well utilised with a relatively high percentage of people of people in the CA travelling to work by bus when compared to the Wiltshire average. Rail provision is not present within the area with the nearest option being Andover 7 miles away.

**Boscombe/Porton new community** - Local bus provision is very poor and there will need to be early uplifts in provision at a cost to the development. There would be possible highway links to the A345 and A338 and possibilities for a future railway station as the railway line passes just to the east of Porton.

The often 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.

**Wilton** - the local highway network is characterised by the A36 running east-west to the north of the settlement. This strategic link can suffer from peak time delays in both directions. Wilton has good bus links with Salisbury, including a Park & Ride, but does not have a railway station.

**Durrington** - the A345 is on the edge of the village where there are regular bus services between north and south Wiltshire. There are also regular bus services to the surrounding army bases. Amesbury and the A303 are very close to Durrington but the village does not have a railway station.

**High Post** – the location of High Post and the existing lack of sufficient local community facilities, education establishments and diverse employment opportunities means that walking and cycling distances are great. High Post Crossroads is currently served by 3 bus services: Activ8, X4 and X5, with fairly regular services during the day. Any materially large development proposals should aim to accommodate the rerouting of a bus service into the site from the A345. Justification for re-routing an existing bus service could only be made for a development of a significant scale. Salisbury Rail Station is approximately 7.5km away and thus beyond any reasonable maximum walking distance. The A345 adjacent presents an adequate high-capacity route, with good connections to the Strategic Road Network in the north (A303) and to the south (A36).

#### **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.

**Amesbury** does not benefit from a direct rail link within the town and therefore future enhancements in public transport provision are likely to come from enhanced bus service provision. The highway infrastructure present within the town, namely its links to the A303 and the A345 running north/south offer this opportunity to build on the already present bus services in the town. In safe active travel terms, National Cycle Route 45 passes through the town while the Amesbury town cycle network plan provides further information on opportunities to enhance provision, no off-road cycle route is currently present to link Amesbury to Salisbury.

**Salisbury** offers already strong provision in sustainable transport terms with bus services operating to surrounding settlements and also to link the suburbs to the centre, park and ride provision also offers opportunity to avoid private car usage within the centre. The railway station equally offers strong opportunity to travel by rail to a number of key locations which can be further utilised to offer public transport alternatives to the private car. In safe active travel terms, a high percentage of journeys to work are by foot in the community area compared to the Wiltshire average with community support appearing to outline a desire to further improve pedestrian facilities within the city. In cycling terms, the Wiltshire cycleway and Salisbury and New Forest routes pass through while National Cycle Network 24 and 45 pass through the area which may offer opportunities. Salisbury town cycle network plan is present highlighting provision and opportunities.

The A338 running north/south through the area offers the main transport link to try to further build on the public transport services that are already present within **Tidworth and Ludgershall**. In this area, further enhancements in the public transport service will mainly be in the bus sector given there is no rail provision present, the nearest being Andover. Walking and cycling as active modes of travel occupy a high modal share in this community area in terms of a travel to work option, likely due to the high military presence with soldiers living and working in short distance of each other. Further development of this type may further develop active travel as a preferred mode of transport for which development should facilitate. A town cycle network plan has been developed to highlight opportunities.

**Boscombe/Porton new community** - Local bus provision is very poor and there will need to be early uplifts in provision at a cost to the development. There would be possible highway links to the A345 and A338 where there are existing bus routes and possibilities for a future railway station as the railway line passes just to the east of Porton.

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.

**Wilton** - future enhancements in public transport provision could come from any enhanced bus service provision linking to Salisbury.

**Durrington** - future enhancements in public transport provision could come from any enhanced bus service provision along the A345.

**High Post** – distances to Amesbury and Salisbury from this location will discourage most from walking and cycling plus there is poor pedestrian and cycling infrastructure along the A345. The site is beyond reasonable maximum walking distances to any community facilities, education establishments, food superstore or a more diverse range of employment opportunities. Any development proposed should therefore be of a scale that can accommodate such uses. Whilst walking for the purposes of regular commuting for accessing existing schools, significant retail or diverse employment can be discounted, pedestrian connectivity to surrounding communities and infrastructure should be sought for recreational and other trip purposes. Such infrastructure should also be designed to accommodate cycle activity, which presents a sustainable alternative to the car for short to medium length (5km to 8km) journeys and longer journeys for E-Bikes. Any materially large development proposals would be expected to provide footway cycleway links to Longhedge and Beehive Park and Ride. High Post Crossroads is currently served by 3 bus services: Activ8, X4 and X5, with fairly regular services during the day. Any materially large development proposals should aim to accommodate the rerouting of a bus service into the site from the A345. Justification for rerouting an existing bus service could only be made for a development of a significant scale. Salisbury Rail Station is approximately 7.5km away and thus beyond any reasonable maximum walking distance.

Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
<b>Amesbury</b>	The levels of growth proposed by all three strategies are not considered likely to have significant adverse effects. Amesbury has good road and public transport links generally and is in close proximity to the A303. One negative is the lack of a railway station, however. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.	The levels of growth proposed by all three strategies are not considered likely to have significant adverse effects. Amesbury has good road and public transport links generally and is in close proximity to the A303. One negative is the lack of a railway station, however. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.	The levels of growth proposed by all three strategies are not considered likely to have significant adverse effects. Amesbury has good road and public transport links generally and is in close proximity to the A303. One negative is the lack of a railway station, however. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	All strategies propose a level of growth at Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above the current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if	All strategies propose a level of growth at Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above the current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be	All strategies propose a level of growth at Salisbury that is likely to exacerbate existing transport issues in the city, whether below or above the current WCS requirement. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed recently for the WHSAP and may need to be looked at again if



	mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	looked at again if mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.	mitigation measures are going to reduce the level of impacts. For all strategies, moderate adverse effects are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Highway congestion at pinch points in the road network at peak periods and uncertainty in future investments into the road network and public transport infrastructure is a limitation for the area. However, significant effects are not considered likely from this level of proposed growth. Minor adverse effects considered likely against this objective.	Highway congestion at pinch points in the road network at peak periods and uncertainty in future investments into the road network and public transport infrastructure is a limitation for the area. However, significant effects are not considered likely from this level of proposed growth. Minor adverse effects considered likely against this objective.	Highway congestion at pinch points in the road network at peak periods and uncertainty in future investments into the road network and public transport infrastructure is a limitation for the area. Opportunities for mitigation are more uncertain as a result of this level of growth and as such significant effects are more likely. Moderate adverse effects are therefore likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	The A36 strategic route can suffer from peak time delays in both directions and the additional growth proposed will likely add to this. However, significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely overall.	The A36 strategic route can suffer from peak time delays in both directions and the additional growth proposed will likely add to this. However, significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely overall.	The A36 strategic route can suffer from peak time delays in both directions and the additional growth proposed will likely add to this. However, significant effects are not considered likely. Minor adverse effects likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	All three strategies are considered likely to have similar effects given similar housing requirements. Growth in the rural parts of the HMA may place development in locations with poorer sustainable transport services and lead to increased travel by private car. For development to somewhat mitigate this effect it would need to be located in places with good existing services and facilities that can be accessed easily by sustainable transport modes. Overall, as development is likely to be dispersed in many settlements throughout the rest of the HMA, effects are likely to be localised and not significant. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.	All three strategies are considered likely to have similar effects given similar housing requirements. Growth in the rural parts of the HMA may place development in locations with poorer sustainable transport services and lead to increased travel by private car. For development to somewhat mitigate this effect it would need to be located in places with good existing services and facilities that can be accessed easily by sustainable transport modes. Overall, as development is likely to be dispersed in many settlements throughout the rest of the HMA, effects are likely to be localised and not significant. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.	All three strategies are considered likely to have similar effects given similar housing requirements. Growth in the rural parts of the HMA may place development in locations with poorer sustainable transport services and lead to increased travel by private car. For development to somewhat mitigate this effect it would need to be located in places with good existing services and facilities that can be accessed easily by sustainable transport modes. Overall, as development is likely to be dispersed in many settlements throughout the rest of the HMA, effects are likely to be localised and not significant. Minor adverse effects considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	This proposed new settlement, in an area with few existing services and facilities, is likely to increase the need to travel with residents travelling north and south to work in other locations. The threshold of 800 dwellings does not present the required gravity to support significant sustainable transport infrastructure and there would likely be a high travel demand. However, a new settlement can be planned with sustainable transport solutions considered from the outset and there are existing bus services along the A345 that stop at High Post and also a Park & Ride at the	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	This proposed new settlement, in an area with few existing services and facilities, is likely to increase the need to travel with residents travelling north and south to work in other locations. The threshold of 800 dwellings does not present the required gravity to support significant sustainable transport infrastructure and there would likely be a high travel demand. However, a new settlement can be planned with sustainable transport solutions considered from the outset and there are existing bus services along the A345 that stop at High Post and also a Park & Ride at the Beehive

	Beehive approx. 3km to the south. Bus services could possibly be re-routed if new development is of a suitable size to make doing so viable. Given the proposed settlement size, rural location of this area of search and few existing services and facilities, significant impacts are considered likely.		approx. 3km to the south. Bus services could possibly be re-routed if new development is of a suitable size to make doing so viable. Given the proposed settlement size, rural location of this area of search and few existing services and facilities, significant impacts are considered likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Boscombe/ Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no new community proposed in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	This strategy includes development of a new community in the Boscombe/Porton area. Given its demographic location this is assessed in combination with its potential impact on Amesbury at this early stage. The location itself is likely to be spatially located near the A303. This may help provide a link to support travel options including bus services, though the viability and impact of such a link will need to be investigated. The location of the A303 can equally cause transport related congestion and rat running, with Amesbury suffering with these problems. The potential impact of a new settlement on these existing concerns must be taken into consideration. Rail provision is currently provided at the nearby Grately station (with limited services) and Salisbury, however, a new community could possibly include a new rail station which would help to promote sustainable travel, though at this stage the viability of such a project remains unknown. Currently, given the uncertainty of mitigation and possible impacts, this level of development at this location is assessed as having moderate adverse effects against this objective.	There is no new community proposed in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	The relatively small amount of growth proposed at a settlement the size of Durrington, with a residual housing requirement of 130 dwellings, is considered likely to have minor adverse effects overall. Durrington has good access to the A345 and A3028 and there are a number of existing bus services in the area. Durrington has a range of local shops, services and facilities, although development is likely to increase car-based travel in the local area.	This strategy does not propose any development at Durrington. Neutral effects likely.	This strategy does not propose any development at Durrington. Neutral effects likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 10</b>	<b>-1.3 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.3 Minor adverse</b>	<b>-1.5 Moderate adverse</b>

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

- Based on scores overall across all settlements/areas, **Strategies SA-E and SA-F are considered the most sustainable strategies against this objective** but there is very little difference between the strategies overall. **SA-G is the least sustainable.**
- Transport issues within the Salisbury 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 within, or near, each settlement. This congestion 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
- Salisbury has been identified for a similar level of growth across the strategies. For all strategies, significant adverse effects are identified at Salisbury because of existing issues with peak time congestion on the strategic road network through Salisbury, and the possibility that additional growth will exacerbate this. The Salisbury Transport Strategy was refreshed to mitigate the effects of proposals in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP) and this may need to be looked at again in order to establish further mitigation measures
- Proposals for Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall are not considered likely to have significant effects, except Strategy SA-G at Tidworth/Ludgershall as opportunities for mitigation are more uncertain as a result of this level of growth
- At Wilton, the A36 strategic route can suffer from peak time delays and the additional growth proposed will likely add to this. However, significant effects are not considered likely for any of the strategies
- In the Rest of the HMA, all three strategies are considered likely to have similar effects given similar housing requirements. Growth in the rural areas may take place in locations with poorer sustainable transport services and it would need to be located in places with good existing services and facilities that can be accessed easily by sustainable transport modes. Overall, as development is likely to be dispersed in many different settlements, effects are likely to be localised and not significant
- The High Post area has few existing services and facilities and the proposals are likely to increase the need to travel considerably. The threshold of 800 dwellings does not present the required gravity to support significant transport infrastructure and there would likely be a high travel demand. Given the proposed settlement size, rural location of this area of search and few existing services and facilities, significant impacts are considered likely that would be difficult to mitigate with this modest growth proposal
- Strategy SA-F includes proposals for a new community in the Boscombe/Porton area. Given its demographic location, this is assessed in combination with its potential impact on Amesbury at this early stage. The location itself is likely to be spatially located near the A303 - this may help provide a link to support local travel options but the location of the A303 can equally cause transport related congestion and rat running. There is no rail provision at Amesbury but a new community could possibly include a new railway station. Currently, given the uncertainty of the location of any new settlement and mitigation and possible impacts, this level of development is assessed as having likely significant adverse effects against this objective
- At Durrington, the relatively small amount of growth proposed is considered likely to have minor adverse effects overall. Durrington has good access to the A345 and A3028 and there are a number of existing bus services in the area. Durrington also has a range of local shops, services and facilities

**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 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 Salisbury HMA is 10ha. Due to the extent of existing employment provision, none of the strategies would be likely to result in major positive or negative effects, as the vast majority is already being met by current employment sites or existing commitments.

At **Salisbury** total employment has stagnated since 2009. There is an above-average concentration of jobs in Wholesale & Retail, and Finance & Insurance. However, the sector profile is very diverse overall, with Finance & insurance highlighted in the JSF as the most prominent sector. Several larger city centre businesses have no capacity in their current workspace to expand against limited availability of central large footplate space and a loss to residential conversion. Life Sciences and defence-related investments in the area remain very strong including at DSTL, PHE, Porton Biopharma, and Phase Two of Porton Science Park forthcoming with full occupancy of Phase One. High Post Trading Estate is again fully occupied, and investments at Churchfields include Nicholas & Harris' factory expansion. 8 small units have been built at Longhedge, all of which sold off plan.

At **Wilton** total employment has dropped significantly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Real Estate, and 'Other' sectors, although due to the small-scale employment base this should not be given too much emphasis.

At **Amesbury** the total number of jobs in the town has increased slightly since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in Professional Services, and Accommodation & Food Services. This reflects potential in life sciences and defence, as indicated in the background documents for the Joint Spatial Framework (JSF) that is being prepared for Swindon and Wiltshire. The 160-acre Solstice Park has been developed relatively rapidly with both large (the TJ Morris/Home Bargains Southern Distribution Centre) and more recently multiple units e.g. the 36-unit Bluestone Centre, with no plots remaining: an indication of buoyant demand for well-connected employment sites with infrastructure in place. Recent developments include new HQs for Animal Friends Insurance, The Tintometer, Birchall Teas; a Greggs Distribution Centre and the forthcoming Helix Trade Park; and multiple food outlets. There has been little progress on any employment development at Boscombe Down, with some indications that this may not come forward.

At **Tidworth** total jobs growth has moved slightly upwards since 2009. There is a high concentration of jobs in the Real Estate, Accommodation & Food, and Public Administration & Defence sectors. The JSF also highlights the economy's reliance on MoD employment. MoD related property investment has been comprehensive, supporting Project Allenby/Connaught and the relocation of up to 4,000 service personnel into the garrison area. The existing units nearby in **Ludgershall** at Castledown Business Park enjoy strong occupancy with a further phase to be marketed for development soon.

**Boscombe/Porton new settlement** – [See Salisbury]

**High Post new community** – [See Salisbury]

Durrington – [See Amesbury]			
Settlement/ Area	Strategy SA – E	Strategy SA – F	Strategy SA – G
Amesbury	Under this strategy, <b>2.5Ha</b> of employment land and 1,425 homes would be required at Amesbury. Recent employment development suggests a buoyant demand for employment land at Amesbury. However, there is some concern that Boscombe Down won't come forward as anticipated. The 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 moderate positive benefits.	Under this strategy, <b>1Ha</b> of employment land and 630 homes would be required at Amesbury. Recent employment development suggests a buoyant demand for employment land at Amesbury. However, there is some concern that Boscombe Down won't come forward as anticipated. This relatively low level of housing and employment proposed will still help to support local businesses, the town centre and provide a slightly increased supply of local labour. However, positive effects will be reduced in comparison to other strategies. It is considered that this strategy would have likely minor benefits.	Under this strategy, <b>2.5Ha</b> of employment land and 1,365 homes would be required at Amesbury. Recent employment development suggests a buoyant demand for employment land at Amesbury. However, there is some concern that Boscombe Down won't come forward as anticipated. The 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 moderate positive benefits.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
Salisbury	Under this strategy, <b>7.5Ha</b> additional employment land and 4400 homes would be required at Salisbury. There are a number of mixed-use employment sites at Salisbury and in the surrounding area, which have strong occupancy rates and strong demand. The city benefits from a low unemployment rate. Existing commitments are now being delivered, reflecting a demand for employment space suggesting additional employment is required up to 2038. Positive effects are likely as a result of further employment growth and new housing. Although the latter equates to lower than WCS levels. Growth would contribute positive effects of supporting local businesses through an increased supply of local labour and in supporting the town centre. Moderate benefits are considered likely overall.	Under this strategy, <b>8Ha</b> additional employment land and 4540 homes would be required at Salisbury. There are a number of mixed-use employment sites at Salisbury and in the surrounding area, which have strong occupancy rates and strong demand. The city benefits from a low unemployment rate. Existing commitments are now being delivered, reflecting a demand for employment space suggesting additional employment is required up to 2038. Positive effects are likely as a result of further employment growth and new housing. Although the latter equates to lower than WCS levels. Growth would contribute positive effects of supporting local businesses through an increased supply of local labour and in supporting the town centre. Moderate benefits are considered likely overall.	Under this strategy, <b>7.5Ha</b> additional employment land and 4375 homes would be required at Salisbury. There are a number of mixed-use employment sites at Salisbury and in the surrounding area, which have strong occupancy rates and strong demand. The city benefits from a low unemployment rate. Existing commitments are now being delivered, reflecting a demand for employment space suggesting additional employment is required up to 2038. Positive effects are likely as a result of further employment growth and new housing. Although the latter equates to lower than WCS levels. Growth would contribute positive effects of supporting local businesses through an increased supply of local labour and in supporting the town centre. Moderate benefits are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
Tidworth and Ludgershall	At Tidworth and Ludgershall <b>2.5Ha</b> additional employment land and 1520 homes would be provided under this strategy. The additional employment provision is predicted to be positive, and the additional housing will also help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. This strategy is less likely to support the delivery of allocated Castledown Business Park.	At Tidworth and Ludgershall <b>2Ha</b> additional employment land and 1140 homes would be provided under this strategy. The additional employment provision is predicted to be positive, and the additional housing will also help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. This strategy is less likely to support the delivery of allocated Castledown Business Park.	At Tidworth and Ludgershall <b>3.5Ha</b> additional employment land and 1940 homes would be provided under this strategy. This strategy proposes the highest number of homes, which suggests an uplift in the local labour market. This could support the additional employment land, as well as facilitating the delivery of allocated land at Castledown Business Park.

	Minor benefits are considered likely overall.	Minor benefits are considered likely overall.	The additional housing will help to support local businesses, the town centres and provide an increased supply of local labour. Moderate benefits are considered likely overall.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Wilton</b>	<b>1Ha</b> of additional employment land and 345 homes are proposed under this strategy. This could provide some support for businesses, the town centre and provide an increased supply of local labour. But this level of employment is unlikely to support the growth in new sectors at Wilton where there is a reliance on employment provision at nearby Salisbury. A minor positive effect is likely.	<b>1Ha</b> of additional employment land and 145 homes are proposed under this strategy. While positive effects will be apparent as a result of growth, the strategy is less like to support more employment and growth in new sectors at Wilton where there is a reliance on employment provision at nearby Salisbury. A minor effect is likely.	<b>1Ha</b> of additional employment land and 145 homes are proposed under this strategy. While positive effects will be apparent as a result of growth, the strategy is less like to support more employment and growth in new sectors at Wilton where there is a reliance on employment provision at nearby Salisbury. A minor effect is likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Under this strategy, <b>13Ha</b> employment land and 2,005 would be required for the rest of the HMA. The employment land is likely to comprise a series of small employment allocations that in themselves would be of a scale that could potentially support the vitality of the rural area. This would depend on suitable locations being identified, where the infrastructure is in place to enable them to be integrated sustainably. The additional housing and employment land will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-E would have moderate positive effects on this objective.	Under this strategy, <b>13Ha</b> employment land and 2,090 would be required for the rest of the HMA. The employment land is likely to comprise a series of small employment allocations that in themselves would be of a scale that could potentially support the vitality of the rural area. This would depend on suitable locations being identified, where the infrastructure is in place to enable them to be integrated sustainably. The additional housing and employment land will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-F would have moderate positive effects on this objective.	Under this strategy, <b>13Ha</b> employment land and 2,090 would be required for the rest of the HMA. The employment land is likely to comprise a series of small employment allocations that in themselves would be of a scale that could potentially support the vitality of the rural area. This would depend on suitable locations being identified, where the infrastructure is in place to enable them to be integrated sustainably. The additional housing and employment land will help to support local businesses however, the vitality of villages, local services and facilities and the countryside, and provide an increased supply of local labour. It is therefore predicted that Strategy SA-G would have moderate positive effects on this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>High Post New Village</b>	A new village at High Post would provide mixed-use development which would be able to support the expansion of existing employment land at High Post and sustainable growth through new housing and employment in this area. <b>1.5Ha</b> of additional employment land and 800 dwellings would be required by this strategy. A minor positive effect is likely.	No housing or employment growth is proposed at High Post under this strategy, therefore neutral effects are likely.	A new village at High Post would provide mixed-use development which would be able to support the expansion of existing employment land at High Post and sustainable growth through new housing and employment in this area. <b>1.5Ha</b> of additional employment land and 800 dwellings would be required by this strategy. A minor positive effect is likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Boscombe/ Porton New Settlement</b>	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.	The new community at Porton / Boscombe Down would provide mixed-use development with a significant amount of housing and employment. It could provide sustainable and balanced growth that would also have a direct relationship with Amesbury. The precise location is not known however, but this significant sized new	There is no housing or employment proposed for a new community in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects.

		settlement, with <b>4Ha</b> of employment land and 2165 dwellings to be required up to 2038 is likely to have moderate positive effects overall against this objective.	
	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Durrington</b>	<b>1Ha</b> of additional employment land and 215 homes would be required under this strategy. This could provide support for businesses, the town centre and an increased supply of local labour. But this level of employment is unlikely to support the growth in new sectors at Durrington where there is a reliance on employment provision at nearby Amesbury. A minor positive effect is likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.	There is no housing or employment proposed for Durrington in this strategy. Therefore, neutral effects are likely.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>	<b>Likely effects: neutral</b>
<b>Overall HMA score for SA Objective 11</b>	<b>1.4 Minor positive</b>	<b>1.5 Moderate positive</b>	<b>1.7 Moderate positive</b>
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, <b>Strategy SA-G is the most sustainable option</b> as it is likely to have the greatest number of benefits across all areas. <b>Strategy SA-E marginally scores as the least sustainable option</b> as it will have fewer benefits across all areas</li> <li>• Strategy SA-F contains proposals for a new settlement at Boscombe Down/Porton and although the exact location is unknown, the significant level of employment and housing is the main reason for the level of benefits. However, there is a degree of uncertainty given there is no precise location and it may take a long time to deliver. While these benefits may be directed towards a new settlement under this strategy, potential benefits at Amesbury are reduced through this strategy due to a lower number of new homes and employment land. This results in marginal differences through this strategy</li> <li>• Settlements/areas in these strategies that combine a higher level of both employment and housing are considered likely to give greater benefits against this objective as both elements help to improve self-containment of settlements and encourage vibrant and diversified places. Employment requirements proposed suggest a proportionate distribution of housing and employment land across all strategies, and as such the strategies perform similarly against this objective</li> <li>• Strong transport links and connectivity are key factors for the successful delivery of large-scale employment allocations, as demonstrated by Solstice Park, Amesbury and Hampton Park, Melksham. The capacity of the A303 corridor to accommodate additional employment growth will need to be tested</li> </ul>			

## SA Annex 1.2 - Salisbury Housing Market Area (HMA) - Assessment of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19)

Settlement/area	Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19)	
	Housing	Employment <sup>3</sup> (ha)
Amesbury	530	0
Salisbury	4,500	0
Tidworth and Ludgershall	2,080	0
New Community: Broad Location for Growth	1,600	5.0
Rest of HMA	2,300	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,010</b>	<b>5.0</b>

### 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
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This proposed housing requirement is higher than most other strategies, comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Overall effects are considered comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to SA-D and SA-F. At Porton/Boscombe Down there are a number of statutory designations likely to be in close proximity. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of likely effect on this objective. Further ecological assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. However, a minor adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered to reduce any impacts. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy given the housing figure proposed is similar. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area in comparison to the Emerging Spatial Strategy which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. The housing figure is still, however, appreciably less than that proposed within SA-C of both the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) and Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment). Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective.

<sup>3</sup> Employment figures based on actual allocations in Local Plan



<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse effect</b>
<p><b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b>  Minor adverse effects are likely overall for this revised strategy against this objective. This means this revised strategy is considered slightly more sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy, which scored -1.75 against this objective. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury and Tidworth and Ludgershall. Housing numbers attributed to Salisbury are lower but still significant and comparably higher at Tidworth and Ludgershall.</p>

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 2: Ensure efficient and effective use of land and the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings</b>	
<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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy. <b>Likely effects: Minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: Minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. Most of this is likely to be Grade 3 BMV with a smaller amount of Grade 2. Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: Minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor adverse effects likely overall for this revised strategy. However, this revised strategy is considered less sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored -1.25. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury and a new community in an unspecified location. Housing numbers attributed to Salisbury are lower but still significant and a new community of the size proposed is likely to have significant adverse effects against this objective.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3: Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner</b>	
<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
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This proposed housing requirement is higher than most other strategies, comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Overall effects are considered comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to SA-D and SA-F. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of likely effect on this objective. Further assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. However, a moderate adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered to reduce any impacts. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy given the housing figure proposed is similar. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area in comparison to the Emerging Spatial Strategy which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. The housing figure is still, however, appreciably less than that proposed within SA-C of both the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) and Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment). Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -2.0 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects are likely overall for this revised strategy against this objective. This means this revised strategy is considered slightly less sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy, which scored -1.75 against this objective. Housing numbers attributed to Salisbury are lower but still significant and comparably higher at Tidworth and Ludgershall.	

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

##### Decision-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 Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>

<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.6 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this revised strategy. This revised strategy is considered less sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored -1.25 overall (minor adverse effect). The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury, a new community in an unspecified location and the rest of the HMA. Housing numbers attributed to Salisbury are lower but still significant and a new community of the size proposed is likely to have significant adverse effects against this objective.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5: Minimise impacts on climate change (mitigation) and reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects (adaptation)).</b>	
<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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This proposed housing requirement is higher than most other strategies, comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Overall effects are considered comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Minor adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to SA-D and SA-F. At this stage, due to uncertainties on the location of any new settlement, it is difficult to assess the degree of likely effect on this objective. Further assessments would be critical to make an informed decision. A minor adverse effect is considered likely. This judgement would be deemed more significant but for the fact that, with a new settlement, it is estimated that mitigation could successfully be delivered to reduce any impacts. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy given the housing figure proposed is similar. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area in comparison to the Emerging Spatial Strategy which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. The housing figure is still, however, appreciably less than that proposed within SA-C of both the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) and Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment). Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.4 minor adverse effect</b>	

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Minor adverse effects likely overall for this revised strategy. This revised strategy is considered less sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy which scored -1.25 overall (minor adverse effect). The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury and the rest of the HMA. Housing numbers attributed to Salisbury are lower but still significant and likely to have significant adverse 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 Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area
<b>Amesbury</b>	The revised spatial strategy proposes less development in Amesbury in comparison to all other strategies assessed. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F above. Although less housing and no employment land is now being proposed in Amesbury the effects are still considered likely to be minor adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The revised spatial strategy proposes less development in Salisbury than the emerging spatial strategy and no employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F above. Although strategy SA-F proposed employment land and no employment land is now being proposed in Salisbury, due to the significant number of heritage assets in and around Salisbury, the effects are still considered likely to be moderate adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	The revised spatial strategy proposes more housing development in Tidworth and Ludgershall in comparison to all other strategies assessed but no employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G above. There are less heritage constraints than other towns the HMA but the level of growth means that effects are considered likely to be moderate adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The revised spatial strategy a new community of 1600 dwellings and 5ha of employment land whereas the emerging spatial strategy did not propose a new community. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) SA-D. Refer to the assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) SA-D. Due to the scale of the new development effects are considered likely to be moderate adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The revised spatial strategy for the rest of the HMA proposed slightly more housing than the revised spatial strategy by 160 dwellings. The emerging spatial strategy is the nearest comparable strategy. Refer to assessment findings in the Emerging Spatial Strategy. The effects are considered likely to be minor adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.6 moderate adverse effect</b>	

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Moderate adverse effects are likely overall for this objective. It is slightly less sustainable than the emerging spatial strategy which had an overall score of 1.5 however this is because of the addition of a new community/broad location for growth. The areas most likely to experience moderate adverse effects are Salisbury, Tidworth and Ludgershall and the new community.

**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
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This proposed housing requirement is higher than most other strategies, comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Overall effects are considered comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield land in a location where landscape impacts could be significant with development highly visible in a valued landscape. However, depending on location, it is considered that landscape-scale mitigation could be feasible, indicating moderate adverse effects for a new community overall. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy given the housing figure proposed is similar. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area in comparison to the Emerging Spatial Strategy which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant. The housing figure is still, however, appreciably less than that proposed within SA-C of both the Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) and Alternative Development Strategy (Local Housing Needs Assessment). Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.8 moderate adverse effect</b>	

**Conclusions/Recommendations:**

Moderate adverse effects are likely overall for this revised strategy against this objective. This means this revised strategy is considered marginally less sustainable than the previous Emerging Spatial Strategy, which scored -1.75 against this objective. The areas most likely to experience significant adverse effects against this objective are Salisbury, Tidworth and Ludgershall, the new community in an unspecified location and the rest of the HMA.

**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
<b>Amesbury</b>	The revised spatial strategy proposes significantly less housing development in Amesbury in comparison to the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F which proposes slightly more housing and 1ha employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Effects are considered likely to be minor positive.

	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The revised spatial strategy for Salisbury proposes less housing and employment land than the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F which proposes very slightly more housing and 8ha more employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Effects are considered likely to be moderate positive.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	The revised spatial strategy for Tidworth and Ludgershall proposes more housing than the emerging spatial strategy but no employment land. The nearest comparable strategy is Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G which proposes slightly less housing but more employment land. Refer to the assessment findings for Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Effects are considered likely to be moderate positive.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The revised spatial strategy proposes a new community of 1600 dwellings and 5ha of employment land. The emerging spatial strategy didn't propose this new community. The nearest comparable strategy is Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) SA-D which proposed 2000 dwellings and 8ha of employment land. Refer to assessment findings for Alternative Development Strategy (Standard Method) SA-D. The new community will provide an opportunity for the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing. Effects are considered likely to be moderate positive.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The revised spatial strategy for the rest of the HMA proposes slightly more dwellings than the emerging spatial strategy. The nearest comparable strategy is the Emerging Spatial Strategy. Refer to the assessment findings for Emerging Spatial Strategy. Effects are considered likely to be minor adverse.
	<b>Likely effects: minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: 1.2 minor positive effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor positive effects likely overall for this objective for this emerging strategy. Moderate positive benefits are likely at Salisbury, Tidworth and Ludgershall and the new community. The strategy is considered to be more sustainable than the emerging spatial strategy due to the inclusion of a new community and the increase in housing at Tidworth and Ludgershall, which could deliver more affordable housing.	

**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?

<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely for this Revised Spatial Strategy.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The overall effects of this Strategy are considered to be most similar to the Assessment of Alternative Development Strategies (Standard Method) Strategy SA-D when considering both the housing and employment element of the strategy albeit that this revised strategy proposes a lower number of houses and there is no employment land allocated. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective.
	<b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This Revised Spatial Strategy has a higher proposed housing requirement than all of the other strategies and proposes no employment land but is overall most comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G and, as such, a moderate positive effect is considered most likely.
	<b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>

<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. The proposed new community could benefit both the surrounding rural areas and main settlements similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, moderate positive effects are likely, towards the back end of the plan period, against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The overall effects of this Revised Spatial Strategy are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy. This Revised spatial strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area which might make any benefits slightly more significant but spread over a wide area. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall score: 1.4 minor positive effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Minor positive effects are likely overall for this emerging strategy. Moderate positive effects are likely in Tidworth and Ludgershall and the new community in an unspecified location for growth. The main differences in effects between this and the Emerging Spatial Strategy are the inclusion of the broad location for growth and significantly higher housing numbers at Tidworth and Ludgershall. This strategy is considered more sustainable than the Emerging Spatial Strategy which had a score of 1.25.	

<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objective 10: Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices</b>	
<u>Decision-Aiding Questions (DAQ)</u>	
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?	
<b>Settlement/Area</b>	<b>Likely effects of Revised Spatial Strategy 2020 – 2038 (Reg 19) per settlement/area</b>
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely for this revised strategy. <b>Likely effects: Minor adverse</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	Overall effects are considered likely to be similar to the Further Alternative Development Strategies assessed, albeit this revised strategy does not include any employment allocation. Overall, moderate adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G. Moderate adverse effects considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: Moderate adverse</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to have significant transport/highways impacts. Currently, given the uncertainty of mitigation and possible impacts, this level of development at this location is assessed as having moderate adverse effects against this objective. <b>Likely effects: Moderate adverse</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	Overall effects considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area which may make any adverse effects slightly more significant but spread out over a wide area. Overall, minor adverse effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: Minor adverse</b>
<b>Overall score: -1.6 moderate adverse effect</b>	
<b>Conclusions/Recommendations:</b> Moderate adverse effects likely overall for this emerging strategy. Significant adverse effects likely in Salisbury, Tidworth and Ludgershall and at a broad location for growth. The main differences in effects between this and the Emerging Spatial Strategy are the inclusion of the broad location for growth and significantly higher housing numbers at Tidworth and Ludgershall. This strategy is considered less sustainable than the Emerging Spatial Strategy which had a score of -1.25.	

**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
<b>Amesbury</b>	This proposed housing requirement of 530 for Amesbury is substantially lower than most other strategies assessed but similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely for this Revised Spatial Strategy. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Salisbury</b>	The overall effects of this Revised Spatial Strategy are considered to be most similar to the Assessment of Alternative Development Strategies (Standard Method) Strategy SA-D when considering both the housing and employment element of the strategy, albeit that this revised strategy proposes a lower number of houses and there is no employment land allocated. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Tidworth and Ludgershall</b>	This Revised Spatial Strategy has a higher proposed housing requirement than all of the other strategies and proposes no employment land but is overall most comparable to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-G and as such a moderate positive effect is considered most likely. <b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>New Community: Broad Location for Growth</b>	The development of a new settlement of 1600 dwellings and 5ha employment in the Boscombe Down/Porton area (exact location unknown) would be likely to take place on greenfield, agricultural land. The proposed new community could benefit both the surrounding rural areas and main settlements and could provide sustainable balanced growth, similar to Further Alternative Development Strategy SA-F. Overall, moderate positive effects are likely towards the back end of the plan period against this objective. <b>Likely effects: moderate positive</b>
<b>Rest of HMA</b>	The overall effects of this Revised Spatial Strategy are considered likely to be similar to the Emerging Spatial Strategy. This revised strategy allocates 160 more dwellings to the rural area which might make any benefits slightly more significant but spread over a wide area. Overall, minor positive effects are considered most likely against this objective. <b>Likely effects: minor positive</b>
<b>Overall score: 1.4 minor positive effect</b>	

**Conclusions/Recommendations:** Minor positive effects likely overall for this Revised Spatial Strategy. Moderate positive effects are likely in Tidworth and Ludgershall and the new community in an unspecified location for growth. The main differences in effects between this and the Emerging Spatial Strategy are the inclusion of the broad location for growth and significantly higher housing numbers at Tidworth and Ludgershall. This strategy is considered more sustainable than the Emerging Spatial Strategy, which had a score of 1.25.