Joint Waste Site Allocations
Site Survey Report

Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council

May 2010

Plan Design Enable

Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council

Joint Waste Site Allocations Site Survey Report

May 2010

Notice

This report was produced by Atkins for **Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council** for the specific purpose of establishing potential planning constraints on sites identified for allocation in the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations preferred options document.

This report may not be used by any person other than Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council without Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council's express permission. In any event, Atkins accepts no liability for any costs, liabilities or losses arising as a result of the use of or reliance upon the contents of this report by any person other than Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council.

Atkins Limited

Document History

JOB NUMBER: 5044619			DOCUMENT REF: Joint Waste Site Allocations Site Survey Report.doc			
02	Final	TB/YE	RB	AH	JD	24/05/10
01	Draft for Client Review	TB/YE	RB	AH	JD	13/04/10
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date

Contents

Section Page

List of Tables

Appendices

List of Abbreviations

Term	Meaning
DPD	Development Plan Document
EU	European Union
GWR	Ground Water Regulations
GED	Ground Water Directive
GWDD	Groundwater Daughter Directive
GWD	Groundwater Directive
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RPB	Regional Planning Body
RFRA	Regional Flood Risk Appraisal
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
EB	Environmental Body
PUAs	Principal Urban Areas
LDF	Local Development Framework
DPD	Development Plan Document

1. Introduction

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) requires Planning Authorities in England and Wales to implement a new system of planning documents called Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) to take the place of Local Plans.

Each LDF comprises several documents, known as Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and each of those documents progresses through several stages of development. This report is concerned with the evidence base to inform the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations DPD, and sets out the results of a series of site surveys carried out by Atkins in 2010 in order to establish and consider the potential planning and environmental constraints of sites identified for potential allocation in the DPD.

Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12)1 sets out what the key ingredients of local spatial plans are and the key government policies on how they should be prepared. PPS 12 (Local Spatial Planning) set out the approach to the process of place shaping and delivery. Spatial planning aims to;

"produce a vision for the future of places that responds to the local challenges and opportunities, and is based on evidence, a sense of local distinctiveness and community derived objectives, within the overall framework of national policy and regional strategies."

The purpose of the surveys and assessments reported in this document is to provide the evidence base to support the allocation of sites for different waste uses in the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations DPD.

The objective of the report is to consider each site in sufficient depth to establish whether or not it should be included in the DPD but not to the standard that would be required in order to support a planning application. The report will also assist in demonstrating that all relevant issues have been considered, major constraints identified and potential mitigation measure have been recognised.

The surveys were carried out by professionally qualified and experienced staff. The methodology employed by each of the subject-matter experts are summarised in Section 3 below. The level of detail to which the surveys and assessments have been carried out satisfy the above objectives but only allow for two broad conclusions. The first is that the site cannot support the proposed development in terms of that particular subject area. Alternatively, the conclusion is that the specific design, layout and methods of operation are not known and, as such, the proposed development may be acceptable with appropriate mitigation. Examples of such mitigation are provided within this report but should not be regarded as an exhaustive list until more detailed investigation has been carried out.

The client established the need for differing sizes and types of facility/use and has identified a selection of sites that may be suitable for each facility or use. That exercise resulted in a geographical spread of sites throughout Wiltshire and Swindon. The sites were required to conform to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West, the policies in the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy DPD[2] and the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Development Control Policies DPD[3]. The sites were then appraised by the client using a method that conforms to the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal imposed by the Act.

[1] Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning, Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008
[2] Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Adopted July 2009, Wiltshire County Council
[3] Wiltshire and Swindon Waste development Control Policies Development Plan Document, Adopted September 2009, Wiltshire County Council

This appraisal applied exclusionary criteria based on anticipated impacts on areas of land subject to statutory and non-statutory designations. Discretionary criteria that might demonstrate a desire to avoid certain development were then applied with separate 'Thresholds of Concern', determined by the client, in order to establish whether further, more detailed, surveys were needed and which topics they should address.

The output from this exercise was a site matrix which formed the basis for the selection of surveys and assessments for the identified sites. Atkins undertook a further audit of the site matrix and identified an additional 7 topic surveys.

Following agreement with the client surveys and assessments were carried out on 52 potential waste sites for the following specialist fields:

Topic Area	No. of Surveys
• Cultural heritage	(13)
• Landscape / Visual Impact	(42)
• Noise	(38)
• Air quality & Odour	(33)
• Water environment	(35)
• Contaminated land	(8)
• Transport	(45)

The agreed site survey matrix is presented in **Table 4.6** included in **Appendix A.**

The surveys and assessments required for each site has been established on a site by site basis with reference to the key planning and environmental issues. Only those assessments judged necessary to determine which sites are suitable to go forward for allocation in the Waste Sites Allocation DPD have been undertaken. This is not to say that these are the only issues which would require consideration in connection with development of the site for the uses concerned, and should not be regarded as scoping opinions, or pre-application advice, on the range of assessment required in order to support a planning application for development of the site for the potential use identified.

In particular, ecological surveys were beyond the scope of this study. These impacts are addressed through the Habitats Regulation Assessment and any Appropriate Assessments, undertaken and reported separately by the client.

Section 4 reports on the outcome of the surveys and assessments. The work has been undertaken on the basis of the supplied information and the assumptions set out in the report. The work has identified a number of significant issues at some of the sites, which are nevertheless considered suitable to go forward subject to further consideration with detailed development proposals and mitigation as may be required at the planning application stage when specific site proposals are known. Sites which are not considered suitable to go forward for allocation in the Waste Sites Allocation DPD are also identified.

2. Policy Context

2.1 Introduction

This section identifies and presents the legislative and policy context within the European, National and Regional policy framework which the Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) is placed.

2.2 European Legislation

2.2.1 Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC

The revised European Union (EU) Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) came into force on 12th December 2008, however, the Member States have until 12th December 2010 to transpose the Directive into national law. The existing waste directive (2006/12/EC) is not substantively repealed / replaced.

The revised Directive (2008/98/EC) sets the basic concepts and definitions related to waste management and lays down measures to protect the environment and human health by preventing or reducing the adverse impacts of the generation and management of waste and by reducing overall impacts of resource use and improving the efficiency of such use.

Under the Framework Directive on Waste, EU Member States must encourage the prevention or reduction of waste and its harmfulness by encouraging the development of clean technologies, technical product improvements and disposal techniques. In addition, they must encourage the recovery of waste (including its use as a source of energy) and prohibit uncontrolled dumping. An adequate network of disposal installations must be established in co-operation with other Member States, using the best available technology which does not entail excessive costs.

Article 5 requires member states to establish an integrated and an adequate network of waste management facilities. Member states must produce waste management plans to illustrate their capabilities in effectively disposing of their own waste. The main objective is to ensure the best disposal or treatment facility is located as close to the origin of the waste as possible.

Article 6 allows for certain specified waste to cease to be waste when it has undergone a recovery, including recycling, operation complies with criteria set out within the conditions of Article 6.

Article 7 allows Member states to consider waste as non-hazardous waste and shall take into account the origin and composition of the waste and, where necessary, the limit values of concentration of hazardous substances.

Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) are required to prepare waste management plans in accordance with the Directive. The Directive requires WPAs to set out an analysis of the current waste management situation in the geographical area concerned, as well as the measures to be taken in accordance with the Directive.

2.2.2 Landfill of Waste Directive 1999/31/EC

The main aim of the Landfill Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill waste is to prevent, or reduce as far as possible, the negative effects of the landfill of waste on the environment and human health. In particular the pollution of surface water, groundwater, soil and air, and on the global environment, including greenhouse effect, as well as any resulting risk to human health, from land filling of waste, during the whole life-cycle of the landfill.

The Directive was introduced to ensure that landfill sites across the European Union face strict regulatory controls on their operation, environmental monitoring and long-term care after closure. The Directive also aims to reduce the emission of methane from landfill sites. Where methane is produced the Directive aims to ensure that it is used productively, by requiring the collection,

treatment and use, where possible, of the gas from all landfills receiving biodegradable waste. To help fulfil its objective of reducing methane emissions, the Landfill Directive introduces progressively diminishing limits on the landfill of biodegradable municipal waste.

The UK, along with other countries with a high dependence on landfill, has been granted a four year derogation to meet the targets imposed by the Directive but those targets can only be met by increased recycling at source and the pre-treatment of wastes to reduce the quantity sent to landfill. This requirement generates the need for recycling and composting facilities.

2.2.3 EU Water Framework Directive

The Water Framework Directive (20000/60/E) came into force in December 2000 and became a part of UK law in December 2003. The directive provides the major driver for protecting, achieving sustainable management of water and enhancing the quality of:

- Surface freshwater (including lakes, streams and rivers);
- Ground waters;
- Ground water dependant ecosystems;
- Estuaries; and
- Coastal waters out to one mile from low-water.

It requires that all inland and coastal waters within defined river basin districts must reach at least good status by 2015.

2.2.4 Ground Water Directives

The provisions of the Water Framework Directive gave rise to the Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC). The aim of the Directive is to protect groundwater from pollution by controlling discharges and disposals of certain dangerous substances to groundwater. In the UK the Directive is implemented through the Groundwater Regulations (GWR) 2009.

Substances controlled under these regulations fall into two categories:

- **Hazardous** substances are the most toxic and must be prevented from entering groundwater. Substances in this list may be disposed of to the ground, under a permit, but must not reach groundwater. They include pesticides, sheep dip, solvents, hydrocarbons, mercury, cadmium and cyanide. Hazardous substances replace the previous List 1 substances which came under the 1998 GWR.
- **Non-hazardous** pollutants are less dangerous, and can be discharged to groundwater under a permit, but must not cause pollution. Examples include sewage, trade effluent and most wastes. Non-hazardous pollutants include any substance capable of causing pollution and the list is much wider than the previous List 2 substances. For example, nitrate is included as a pollutant but it was excluded from List 2 in the 1998 GWR.

The existing Groundwater Directive is to be repealed by the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (WFD) in 2013. The GWR 2009 have recently been made law to enact both the WFD and its Daughter Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater. This new Groundwater Directive (2006/118/EC) is commonly referred to as the Groundwater Daughter Directive (GWDD).

The GWD imposes duties on both Central Government and the Environment Agency. As such it is a material consideration in the formulation of LDFs and has been accommodated by the surveys relating to water quality, water environment and geology.

2.3 National Policy

Central Government provides advice on policy formation to local planning authorities through Planning Policy Guidance (PPG's) more recently, Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and the Waste Strategy. This subsection identifies the guidance which is of relevance to the development of local waste policies.

2.3.1 Waste Strategy

Waste Strategy 2000 describes the Government's vision for better managing waste resources in England and Wales, and sets out the changes needed to deliver more sustainable development. The Strategy sets targets for reducing the amount of household and industrial/commercial waste going to landfill until 2015, as well as for the recovery of municipal waste, the recycling and composting of household waste and the reduction of household waste. The Strategy sets out guidelines about how the Government expects itself, business, the waste management industry, waste planning authorities, waste collection and disposal authorities, the Environment Agency and the community sector to deliver these changes.

Waste Strategy for England 2007 sets out new national targets for the reduction of commercial and industrial waste going to landfill. Levels of commercial and industrial waste landfilled are expected to fall by 20% by 2010 compared to 2004.

The main elements of the new strategy are to:

- Incentivise efforts to reduce, re-use, recycle waste and recover energy from waste;
- Reform regulation to drive the reduction of waste and diversion from landfill while reducing costs to compliant business and the regulator;
- Target action on materials, products and sectors with the greatest scope for improving environmental; and economic outcomes;
- Stimulate investment in collection, recycling and recovery infrastructure, and markets for recovery materials that will maximise the value of materials and energy recovered; and
- Improve national, regional and local governance, with a clearer performance and institutional framework to deliver better coordinated action and services on the ground.

Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) are being replaced by Planning Policy Statements which set out the Policy framework with which individual policies are to conform. Of particular interest to this process are the following;

Planning Policy Statements

PPS 1	Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS 1	Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS1
PPS 4	Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS 5	Planning for the Historic Environment
PPS 7	Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
PPS 9	Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPS 10	Planning for Sustainable Waste Management
PPS 12	Local Spatial Planning
PPS 22	Renewable Energy
PPS 23	Planning and Pollution Control
PPS 25	Development and Flood Risk

Planning Policy Guidance

PPG 2	Green Belt
PPG 13	Transport
PPG 17	Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
PPG 24	Planning and Noise

2.3.2 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS1 sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. These policies complement, but do not replace or override, other national planning policies and should be read in conjunction with other relevant statements of national planning policy. Paragraphs 4 and 5 state that;

Paragraph 4
The Government set out four aims for sustainable development in its 1999 strategy.[4]
These are:

- *social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;*
- *effective protection of the environment;*
- *the prudent use of natural resources; and,*
- *the maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.*

These aims should be pursued in an integrated way through a sustainable, innovative and productive economy that delivers high levels of employment, and a just society that promotes social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal well being, in ways that protect and enhance the physical environment and optimise resource and energy use.

Paragraph 5
Planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural development by:

- *making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives to improve people's quality of life;*
- *contributing to sustainable economic development;*
- *protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside, and existing communities;*
- *ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design, and the efficient use of resources; and,*
- *ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community.*

The stated aims have been taken into account in the methodology adopted for the assessment of sites.

Paragraphs 19, 20 and 26 of PPS1 give further detail and advice to Local Authorities on the content of their DPDs.

Paragraph 19
Plan policies and planning decisions should be based on:

- *up-to-date information on the environmental characteristics of the area;*
- *the potential impacts, positive as well as negative, on the environment of development proposals (whether direct, indirect, cumulative, long-term or short-term)8; and,*
- *recognition of the limits of the environment to accept further development without irreversible damage.*

Planning authorities should seek to enhance the environment as part of development proposals. Significant adverse impacts on the environment should be avoided and alternative options which might reduce or eliminate those impacts pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, planning authorities and developers should consider possible mitigation measures. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate. In line with the UK sustainable development strategy, environmental costs should fall on those who impose them – the "polluter pays" principle.

Paragraph 20
Development plan policies should take account of environmental issues such as:

- *mitigation of the effects of, and adaptation to, climate change through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the use of renewable energy; air quality and pollution; land*

[4] A Better Quality of Life – A Strategy for Sustainable Development for the UK – CM 4345, May 1999. The strategy is currently subject to review.

contamination; the protection of groundwater from contamination; and noise and light pollution;
- *the protection of the wider countryside and the impact of development on landscape quality; the conservation and enhancement of wildlife species and habitats and the promotion of biodiversity; the need to improve the built and natural environment in and around urban areas and rural settlements, including the provision of good quality open space; the conservation of soil quality; and the preservation and enhancement of built and archaeological heritage;*
- *the potential impact of the environment on proposed developments by avoiding new development in areas at risk of flooding and sea-level rise, and as far as possible, by accommodating natural hazards and the impacts of climate change; and,*
- *the management of waste in ways that protect the environment and human health, including producing less waste and using it as a resource wherever possible.*

Paragraph 26
In preparing development plans, planning authorities should:

- *Recognise the needs and broader interests of the community to secure a better quality of life for the community as a whole.*
- *Ensure that plans are drawn up over appropriate time scales, and do not focus on the short term or ignore longer term impacts and the needs of communities in the future. Planning authorities should consider both whether policies have short term benefits which may have long term costs, but also whether short term detriments (which are capable of being mitigated) may be offset by longer term benefits which are realistically achievable.*
- *Not impose disproportionate costs, in terms of environmental and social impacts, or by unnecessarily constraining otherwise beneficial economic or social development.*
- *Have regard to the resources likely to be available for implementation and the costs likely to be incurred, and be realistic about what can be implemented over the period of the plan.*
- *Take account of the range of effects (both negative and positive) on the environment, as well as the positive effects of development in terms of economic benefits and social well being. Effects should be properly identified and assessed through the sustainability appraisal process, taking account of the current quality of the environment in the area and any existing environmental issues relevant to the plan.*
- *Ensure that plans and policies are properly based on analysis and evidence. Where the outcome of that analysis and evidence remains uncertain, policy makers should exercise and demonstrate soundly based judgement, taking account of the other principles set out in this paragraph. Where justifiable on the basis of the evidence available, a precautionary approach to proposals for development may be necessary.*
- *Take full account of the need for transparency, information and participation.*
- *Recognise that the impact of proposed development may adversely affect people who do not benefit directly. Local planning authorities can use planning conditions or obligations to ameliorate such impacts.*

The site survey project has been carried out in support of this advice and the recommended mitigation measures are based on current best practice, within the constraints of the level of detail that has been supplied for the proposed developments.

2.3.3 Planning Policy Statement 1: Planning and Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to PPS1

The PPS on Climate Change was published in December 2007, sets out how planning in providing for new homes, jobs and infrastructure needed by communities, should help shape places with lower carbon emissions and resilient to the climate change, and the expectation of good planning.

Paragraph 10
LPAs are required to adhere to the following principles in making decisions about their spatial strategies:

- *the proposed provision for new development, its spatial distribution, location and design should be planned to limit carbon dioxide emissions;*

- *new development should be planned to make good use of opportunities for decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy;*
- *new development should be planned to minimise future vulnerability in a changing climate;*
- *climate change considerations should be integrated into all spatial planning concerns;*
- *mitigation and adaptation should not be considered independently of each other, and new development should be planned with both in mind;*
- *sustainability appraisal (incorporating strategic environmental assessment) should be applied to shape planning strategies and policies that support the Key Planning Objectives; and*
- *appropriate indicators should be selected for monitoring and reporting on in regional planning bodies' and planning authorities' annual monitoring reports. Such monitoring should be the basis on which regional planning bodies and planning authorities periodically review and roll forward their planning strategies.*

Paragraph 19
In developing their core strategy and supporting LDDs, LPAs should provide a framework that promotes and encourages renewable and carbon energy generation. Policies should be designed to promote and not restrict renewable and low-carbon energy and supporting infrastructure.

Paragraph 20
In particular, planning authorities should:-

- *not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location;*
- *ensure any local approach to protecting landscape and townscape is consistent with PPS22 and does not preclude the supply of any type of renewable energy other than in the most exceptional circumstances;*
- *alongside any criteria-based policy developed in line with PPS22, consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources, but in doing so take care to avoid stifling innovation including by rejecting proposals solely because they are outside areas identified for energy generation; and*
- *expect a proportion of the energy supply of new development to be secured from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources.*

Paragraph 23
In deciding which areas and sites are suitable, and for what type and intensity of development, planning authorities should assess their consistency with the policies in this PPS.

Paragraph 24
In doing so, planning authorities should take into account:

- *the extent to which existing or planned opportunities for decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy could contribute to the energy supply of development;*
- *whether there is, or the potential for, a realistic choice of access by means other than the private car and for opportunities to service the site through sustainable transport;*
- *the capacity of existing and potential infrastructure (including for water supply, sewage and sewerage, waste management and community infrastructure such as schools and hospitals) to service the site or area in ways consistent with cutting carbon dioxide emissions and successfully adapting to likely changes in the local climate;*
- *the ability to build and sustain socially cohesive communities with appropriate community infrastructure, having regard to the full range of local impacts that could arise as a result of likely changes to the climate;*
- *the effect of development on biodiversity and its capacity to adapt to likely changes in the climate;*
- *the contribution to be made from existing and new opportunities for open space and green infrastructure to urban cooling, sustainable drainage systems, and conserving and enhancing biodiversity; and*

- *known physical and environmental constraints on the development of land such as sea level rises, flood risk and stability, and take a precautionary approach to increases in risk that could arise as a result of likely changes to the climate.*

Paragraph 25
In deciding on areas and sites to identify for development, priority should be given to those that will perform well against the criteria set out in paragraph 24. Where areas and sites perform poorly, planning authorities should consider whether their performance could be improved. When considering the need to secure sustainable rural development, including employment and affordable housing opportunities to meet the needs of local people, planning authorities should recognise that a site may be acceptable even though it may not be readily accessible other than by the private car.

2.3.4 Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PPS 4 sets out planning policies for economic development. Economic development includes development within the B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses.

Policy EC6: Planning for Economic Development in Rural Areas

LPAs are required to ensure that the countryside is protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all.

In rural areas, local planning authorities should:

- *strictly control economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans*
- *identify local service centres (which might be a country town, a single large village or a group of villages) and locate most new development in or on the edge of existing settlements where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together*
- *support the conversion and re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside (particularly those adjacent or closely related to towns or villages) for economic development*
- *set out the permissible scale of replacement buildings and circumstances where replacement of buildings would not be acceptable*
- *seek to remedy any identified deficiencies in local shopping and other facilities to serve people's day-to-day needs and help address social exclusion*
- *set out the criteria to be applied to planning applications for farm diversification, and support diversification for business purposes that are consistent in their scale and environmental impact with their rural location*
- *where appropriate, support equine enterprises, providing for a range of suitably located recreational and leisure facilities and the needs of training and breeding businesses that maintain environmental quality and countryside character.*

2.3.5 Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment

PPS 5 was published in March 2010 and a set out the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. PPS 5 replaces Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG15) published on 14 September 1994; and Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16), published on 21 November 1990.

The Government's objectives for planning for the historic environment are:

- *to deliver sustainable development by ensuring that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment:*
  - *recognise that heritage assets are a non-renewable resource*
  - *take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation; and*
  - *recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.*

- *to conserve England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that:*
  - *decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of that significance, investigated to a degree proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset*
  - *wherever possible, heritage assets are put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with their conservation*
  - *the positive contribution of such heritage assets to local character and sense of place is recognised and valued; and*
  - *consideration of the historic environment is integrated into planning policies, promoting place-shaping.*

- *to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available, particularly where a heritage asset is to be lost.*

Policy HE2

Paragraph HE2.3 requires LPAs to use the evidence base to assess the type, numbers, distribution, significance and condition of heritage assets and the contribution that they may make to their environment now and in the future. It should also be used to help predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future.

Policy HE3

Paragraph HE3.2 requires that the level of detail contained in LDF should reflect the scale of the area covered by the plan and the significance of the heritage assets within it.

Paragraph HE3.4 states that at the local level, plans should consider the qualities and local distinctiveness of the historic environment and how these can contribute to the development of the spatial vision in the local development framework core strategy. Heritage assets can be used to ensure continued sustainability of an area and promote a sense of place.

Policy HE4

Paragraph HE4.1: Local planning authorities should consider whether the exercise of permitted development rights would undermine the aims for the historic environment. If it would, local planning authorities should consider the use of an article 4 direction to ensure any development is given due consideration.

2.3.6 Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable development in Rural Areas

PPS 7 was published in 2004 and expresses Central government objectives and the key principles that should be applied when considering rural land use planning. The sustainable development principles seek to ensure that decisions on development proposals are based on:

- social inclusion, recognising the needs of everyone
- effective protection and enhancement of the environment;
- prudent use of natural resources; and
- maintaining high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

Paragraphs 4, 6 and 16 give further detail and advice to Local Authorities on the preferred location for certain developments within their DPDs.

Paragraph 4
Planning authorities should set out in LDDs their policies for allowing some limited development in, or next to, rural settlements that are not designated as local service centres, in order to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities.

Paragraph 6
Local Planning Authorities should:

ii. identify suitable buildings and development sites for community services and facilities to meet the needs of the whole community, including disabled users;

The Household Waste Recycling Facilities fall directly into this category and the remainder of the sites fall indirectly into the category of sites needed to satisfy the waste treatment and disposal needs of the community at large.

Paragraph 16
When Planning Authorities are developing Development Plan Documents they should,

iii. take account of the need to protect natural resources; and
v. conserve specific features and sites of landscape, wildlife and historic or architectural value, in accordance with statutory designations.

This guidance is reflected in the range of surveys that have been undertaken in order to give the required level of 'robustness' to te quality of the evidence base.

The relatively high occurrence in Swindon Borough and Wiltshire County of nationally designated areas has been a driving factor in the analysis of the site survey information. The protection recommended in PPS7 at this stage of the DPD process is contained in Paragraphs 21 and 22 below;

Paragraph 21
Nationally designated areas comprising National Parks, the Broads, the New Forest Heritage Area and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas. The conservation of wildlife and the cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas. They are a specific purpose for National Parks, where they should also be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions. As well as reflecting these priorities, planning policies in LDDs and where appropriate, RSS, should also support suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these designated areas and their communities, including the provision of adequate housing to meet identified local needs.

Paragraph 22
Major developments should not take place in these designated areas, except in exceptional circumstances. This policy includes major development proposals that raise issues of national significance. Because of the serious impact that major developments may have on these areas of natural beauty, and taking account of the recreational opportunities that they provide, applications for all such developments should be subject to the most rigorous examination. Major development proposals should be demonstrated to be in the public interest before being allowed to proceed. Consideration of such applications should therefore include an assessment of:

i the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

ii the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and

iii any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

Local Landscape Designations

PPS 7 requires carefully drafted, criteria-based policies in LDDs with reliance on robust Landscape Character Assessments to inform decisions on sustainable development and economic activity in the rural environment rather than 'rigid' local designations.

2.3.7 Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management

PPS 10 published in 2005, replaces PPG10 and sets out the Government's policies on planning with respect to waste management. It provides advice about how the land-use planning system

should contribute to sustainable waste management through the provision of the required waste management facilities in England and how this provision is regulated under the statutory planning and waste management systems. PPS 10 must be taken into account by local planning authorities as they prepare development plans and may be material to decisions on individual planning applications.

Paragraph 5 advises that Waste Planning Authorities should adhere to the following principle (amongst others) in determining planning applications:

- *in considering planning applications for waste management facilities before development plans can be reviewed to reflect this PPS, have regard to the policies in this PPS as material considerations which may supersede the policies in their development plan. Any refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will not be justified unless it accords with the policy in The Planning System: General Principles.*

Paragraph 17 requires Waste planning authorities to identify in development plan documents sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities for the waste management needs of their areas. Waste planning authorities should in particular:

- *allocate sites to support the pattern of waste management facilities set out in the RSS in accordance with the broad locations identified in the RSS; and,*
- *allocate sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities to support the apportionment set out in the RSS.*

Paragraph 20
In searching for sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities, waste planning authorities should consider:

- *opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises;*
- *a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities.*

In deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, waste planning authorities should:

(i) assess their suitability for development against each of the following criteria:

- *the extent to which they support the policies in this PPS;*
- *the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses;*
- *the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential;*
- *the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.*

(ii) give priority to the re-use of previously-developed land, and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages.

2.3.8 Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning

PPS 12 sets out what the key ingredients of local spatial plans are and the key government policies on how they should be prepared. PPS 12 (Local Spatial Planning) replaces PPS 12 Local Development Frameworks.

The Local Development Framework is the collection of local development documents produced by the local planning authority which collectively delivers the spatial planning strategy for its area. The Core Strategy is the key plan within the Local Development Framework.

Core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. Progress on the core strategy should not be held up by inclusion of non strategic sites.

The core strategy looks to the long term. It may be beneficial to delivery of its objectives for details of key sites to be included in it, where these sites are central to the achievement of the strategy and where investment requires a long lead-in. But in general the core strategy will not include site specific detail which can date quickly. Where core strategies allocate strategic sites, they must include a submission proposals map. It may be preferable for the site area to be delineated in outline rather than detailed terms, with site specific criteria set out to allow more precise definition through masterplanning using an area action plan (if required) or through a supplementary planning document (SPD). If it is necessary to allocate land which has not already been allocated in the core strategy, a DPD rather than SPD must be used.

Local authorities should undertake timely, effective and conclusive discussion with key stakeholders on what option(s) for a core strategy are deliverable. Key stakeholders should engage in timely and effective discussions with local planning authorities on the deliverability of options for core strategies.

2.3.9 Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy

PPS22 sets out the Government's policies for renewable energy, which planning authorities should have regard to when preparing LDDs.

PPS22 requires LPA's to only allocate specific sites for renewable energy in plans where a developer has already indicated an interest in the site, has confirmed that the site is viable, and that it will be brought forward during the plan period. Planning applications for renewable energy projects should be assessed against specific criteria set out in regional spatial strategies and local development documents. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should ensure that such criteria-based policies are consistent with, or reinforced by, policies in plans on other issues against which renewable energy applications could be assessed.

2.3.10 Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control

PPS23 replaces PPG23 which has been cancelled. Waste Planning, including operations under Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994 and the Pollution Prevention and Control Regulations 2000.

PPS23 require LPAs to include appropriate policies and proposals for dealing with the potential for contamination and the remediation of land so that it is suitable for the proposed development/use.

Paragraph 20 states that: Contamination of land may threaten public health and safety, the natural environment, the built environment and economic activities, through its impacts on the users of the land, and on neighbouring users. Land contamination, or the possibility of it, is therefore a material planning consideration in the preparation of development plan documents and in taking decisions on individual planning applications. It remains the responsibility of the landowner/developer to identify land affected by contamination and to ensure that remediation is undertaken to secure a safe development.

Paragraph 24 requires LPAs to pay particular attention to development proposals for sites where there is a reason to suspect contamination, such as the existence of former industrial uses, or other indications of potential contamination, and to those for particularly sensitive use such as a day nursery or housing likely to be used by families with children. In such cases, it should normally require at least a desk study of the readily-available records assessing the previous uses of the site and their potential for contamination in relation to the proposed development. If the potential for contamination is confirmed, further studies by the intending developer to assess the risks and identify and appraise the options for remediation should be required.

2.3.11 Planning Policy Statement 25

PPS25 sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. PPS25 aims to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.

Paragraph 7 requires LPAs in the preparation of LDDs, to adhere to the following principles:

- *LDDs that set out policies for the allocation of sites and the control of development which avoid flood risk to people and property where possible and manage it elsewhere, reflecting the approach to managing flood risk in this PPS and in the RSS for their region;*
- *flood risk should be considered alongside other spatial planning issues such as transport, housing, economic growth, natural resources, regeneration, biodiversity, the historic environment and the management of other hazards. Policies should recognise the positive contribution that avoidance and management of flood risk can make to the development of sustainable communities, including improved local amenities and better overall quality of life. They should be integrated effectively with other strategies of material significance such as Regional Economic Strategies; and*
- *the sustainable appraisal of LDDs should incorporate or reflect the RPB's, RFRA and the LPAs SFRA, so as to ensure planning strategies for the area support the Government's objectives for development and flood risk set out in PPS25.*

Paragraph 9 states: A risk-based approach should be adopted at all levels of planning. Applying the source pathway- receptor model to planning for development in areas of flood risk requires:

- *a strategic approach through policies in RSSs and LDDs which avoid adding to the causes or "sources" of flood risk, by such means as avoiding inappropriate development in flood risk areas and minimising run-off from new development onto adjacent and other downstream property, and into the river systems;*
- *managing flood "pathways" to reduce the likelihood of flooding by ensuring that the design and location of the development maximises the use of SUDS, and takes account of its susceptibility to flooding, the performance and processes of river/coastal systems and appropriate flood defence infrastructure, and of the likely routes and storage of floodwater, and its influence on flood risk downstream; and*
- *reducing the adverse consequences of flooding on the "receptors" (ie people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites) by avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding.*

Paragraph 12 requires that a SFRA should be carried out by the LPA to inform the preparation of its LDDs, having regard to catchment-wide flooding issues which affect the area. The SFRA will provide the information needed to apply the sequential approach. Policies in LDDs should set out requirements for site-specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) to be carried out by developers and submitted with planning applications in areas of flood risk identified in the plan, under circumstances set out in PPS25.

Paragraph 25 requires LPAs to consult the EA and other relevant bodies (including adjacent LPAs) in the preparation of LDDs on flood risk management and in relation to areas potentially identified as at risk of flooding. Their sustainability appraisals, land allocations and development control policies should all be informed by a SFRA carried out in liaison with the Environment Agency.

2.3.12 Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts

PPG2 outlines the Government's Green Belt land-use objectives and sets out the presumption against inappropriate development.

In the preparation of LDDs, PPG2 any proposals affecting Green Belts should be related to a time-scale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan. LPAs should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. In order to ensure protection of Green Belts within this longer timescale, this will in some cases mean safeguarding land between the urban area and the Green Belt which may be required to meet longer-term development needs.

***Paragraph 1.16** once Green Belts have been defined, the use of land in them has a positive role to play: in fulfilling the following objectives:*

- *to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population;*
- *to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas;*
- *to retain attractive landscapes, and enhance landscapes, near to where people live;*

- *to improve damaged and derelict land around towns;*
- *to secure nature conservation interest; and*
- *to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.*

Paragraph 2.12 *states: In the preparation of development plans LPAs are required to address the possible need to provide safeguarded land. LPAs should consider the broad location of anticipated development beyond the plan period, its effects on urban areas contained by the Green Belt and on areas beyond it, and its implications for sustainable development. Where necessary indicate a general area where LDDs should identify safeguarded land.*

Paragraph 3.13 *explains that when any large-scale development or redevelopment of land occurs in the Green Belt (including mineral extraction, the tipping of waste, and road and other infrastructure developments or improvements), it should, so far as possible contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts (see paragraph 1.6). This approach applies to large-scale developments irrespective of whether they are appropriate development, or inappropriate development which is justified by very special circumstances. Development plans should make clear the local planning authority's intended approach.*

2.3.13 Planning Policy Guidance 13 Transport

PPG13's objectives are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level to promote more sustainable transport choices both for carrying people and for moving freight.

PPG13 sets out the circumstances where it is appropriate to change emphasis and priorities provision between different transport modes, in pursuit of wider Government objectives.

LPAs should: ensure that strategies in the development and local transport plan complement each other and that consideration of development plan allocations and local transport investment and priorities are closely linked

2.3.14 Planning Policy Guidance 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

PPG17 sets out policies needed to be taken into account in the preparation of LDD.

Paragraph 17 *states LPA's should:*

- *avoid any erosion of recreational function and maintain or enhance the character of open spaces;*
- *ensure that open spaces do not suffer from increased overlooking, traffic flows or other encroachment;*
- *protect and enhance those parts of the rights of way network that might benefit open space; and*
- *consider the impact of any development on biodiversity and nature conservation.*

In identifying where to locate new areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities, local authorities should:

i. avoid any significant loss of amenity to residents, neighbouring uses or biodiversity;

vii carefully consider security and personal safety, especially for children;

viii meet the regeneration needs of areas, using brownfield in preference to Greenfield sites;

ix. consider the scope for using any surplus land for open space, sport or recreational use, weighing this against alternative uses;

2.3.15 Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise

PPG24 provides guidelines for LPAs in England on the use of their planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise. It outlines the considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications both for noise-sensitive developments and for those activities which generate noise.

LPAs are required to ensure Noise policies in development plans give developers and local communities a degree of certainty about the areas in which particular types of development will be acceptable and those in which special measures may be required in order to mitigate the impact of noise.

Paragraph 5 states that plans should contain policies designed to ensure, as far as is practicable, that noise sensitive developments are located away from existing sources of significant noise (or programmed development such as new roads) and that potentially noisy developments are located in areas where noise will not be such an important consideration or where its impact can be minimised. It may also be appropriate for local planning authorities to adopt policies to avoid potentially noisy developments in areas, which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise nuisance and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

2.4 National Legislation

2.4.1 The Environmental Protection Act 1990

To prevent the pollution from emissions to air, land or water from scheduled processes the concept of integrated pollution control has been introduced. Authorisation to operate the relevant processes must be obtained from the enforcing authority which, for the more heavily polluting industries, is HM Inspectorate of Pollution. Control of pollution to air from the less heavily polluting processes is through the local authority.

Regulations also place a 'duty of care' on all those involved in the management of waste, be it collecting, disposing or treating Controlled Waste which is subject to licensing.

In addition to extending the Clean Air Acts by including new measures to control nuisances, the Regulations introduce litter control; amend the Radioactive Substances Act 1960; regulate genetically modified organisms; regulate the import and export of waste; regulate the supply, storage and use of polluting substances and allow the setting up of contaminated land registers by the local authority. In 1991 the Water Act 1989 that controlled the pollution and supply of water was replaced by five separate Acts.

The Environmental Protection Act 1990 places certain obligations on businesses to ensure that their waste is suitably contained and disposed of in a proper manner.

2.4.2 Environment Act 1995

The Environment Act 1995 has placed an obligation on local authorities to consult with local stakeholders as part of their air quality management process. This represents one of the largest locally based environmental consultation initiatives undertaken in the UK.

This emphasis on including non-expert views and opinions reflects a growing trend in environmental decision-making that acknowledges the need for local networks of communities to be involved in local air quality management.

2.4.3 Special Waste Regulations 1996

This updates the Control of Pollution (Special Waste) Regulations 1980 on defining special wastes in order to conform to EU legislation on hazardous wastes. The regulations also detail the consignment note system that requires waste to be accompanied by a note from the point of production to disposal.

2.4.4 Landfill (England and Wales) Regulations 2002

The Landfill Directive is helping to bring about a change in the way we dispose of waste in the UK. It aims to reduce the pollution potential from landfilled waste that can impact on surface water, groundwater, soil, air, and also contribute to climate change. In England and Wales the directive is applied under the Landfill (England and Wales) Regulations 2002 and fully implemented by July 2009. The directive sets demanding targets to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal landfilled waste.

Part I of the Regulations sets out the preliminary provisions. Regulation 3 sets out their scope (subject to the certain exceptions contained in regulation 4). Regulation 5 requires planning authorities to take the location requirements of these Regulations into consideration when granting planning permission. Regulation 6 amends the 2000 Regulations so that all landfills covered by these Regulations are Part A(1) installations for the purposes of those Regulations and therefore require a permit under those Regulations. The powers to set conditions in permits under the 2000 Regulations are disapplied for landfills as alternative powers are included in these Regulations.

Part II deals with conditions to be included in landfill permits. Regulation 7 requires the Environment Agency to classify landfills as for hazardous waste, non-hazardous waste or inert waste. Regulation 8 sets out the requirements for conditions to be incorporated in landfill permits. These include conditions for ensuring compliance by landfill operators with the relevant requirements of these Regulations which are set out in remaining regulations in this Part and Schedules 1 (waste acceptance criteria), 2 (general requirements) and 3 (monitoring procedures). Regulation 16 provides for closure notices which may be used by the Environment Agency to initiate closure of landfills.

Part III contains miscellaneous provisions. Regulation 17 creates offences where waste is accepted contrary to the requirements which apply directly to landfill operators under paragraph 3 of Schedule 4. Regulation 19(1) amends the Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991, which impose requirements to document transfers of controlled waste, to add a requirement to identify the waste by reference to the appropriate category in the European Waste Catalogue. This provision comes into force on 31st August 2002.

Schedule 4 contains transitional provisions for existing landfills. It sets up a procedure for operators of landfills that will remain operational after 16th July 2002 to bring their operations into compliance with the relevant requirements of these Regulations. Sites which cannot comply will be closed, while the remainder will be granted new permits in accordance with these Regulations as soon as possible within a transitional period up to 31st March 2007.

Schedule 5 makes amendments to other secondary legislation. Amendments are made to the 2000 Regulations and the Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994 (which covers those landfills previously not subject to the 2000 Regulations) to deal with the introduction of the requirements of these Regulations. Amendments are also made to the "fit and proper person" test applied by regulation 4 of the 2000 Regulations relating to arrangements an operator has to have in place to ensure the landfill is properly managed and financed.

2.5 Regional Policy

2.5.1 Regional Planning Guidance for South West

Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (RPG10) Adopted in September 2001, sets out a sustainable regional development strategy for the period to 2016.

RPG10 is being replaced by a Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (SWRSS) which will form part of the development plan when it is adopted. The SWRSS is in an advanced stage of preparation. The Secretary of State's proposed changes were published at the end of last year, and a decision on publication of the final version is expected soon.

The RPG provides regional spatial strategy within which LPA should prepare their LDDs. It sets out a broad development strategy for the period up to 2016 and beyond. It also provides the spatial framework for their strategies and programmes.

Paragraph 4.3 sets out one of the key objectives of the RPG being to safeguard and enhance the quality and diversity of the natural, cultural and built environment across the region, giving the highest level of protection to designated areas and features of national and international importance.

Policy EN 1: Landscape and Biodiversity

Local authorities and other agencies in their plans, policies and proposals, should:

- *provide for the strong protection and enhancement of the region's internationally and nationally important landscape areas and nature conservation sites;*
- *draw up policies for the protection of nature conservation interests of regional and local significance;*
- *encourage the maintenance and enhancement of the biodiversity resources of the region, having particular regard to the targets set out in tables 3, 4 and 5;*
- *promote the restoration and expansion of depleted and vulnerable biodiversity resources in order to reverse fragmentation and create continuous viable habitats;*
- *indicate that the protection and, where possible, enhancement of the landscape and biodiversity should be planned into new development;*
- *have regard to the significant landscape joint character areas of the region set out in the RPG and aim to conserve and enhance local character;*
- *take measures to protect the character of the countryside and the environmental features that contribute towards that character, including the minimisation of light pollution.*

Policy EN2: Air Quality

Local authorities should:

- *include in their development plans and proposals policies on the location of potentially polluting developments and of sensitive developments in the vicinity of existing polluting developments, in line with guidance in PPG23 (as and when it is updated) and in Air Quality and land use planning LAQM.G3 (00);*
- *designate air quality management areas where required as part of the local air quality management process;*
- *ensure that air quality considerations are properly considered along with other material considerations in the planning process, particularly where any air quality management areas have been designated.*

Policy EN 3: The Historic Environment

Local authorities and other agencies in their plans, policies and proposals should:

- *afford the highest level of protection to historic and archaeological areas, sites and monuments of international, national and regional importance;*
- *indicate that new development should preserve or enhance historic buildings and conservation areas and important archaeological features and their settings, having regard to the advice in PPG15 and PPG16;*
- *indicate that policies and programmes should work towards rescuing buildings and monuments at risk;*
- *encourage the restoration and appropriate re-use of buildings of historic and architectural value and take a particularly active role in bringing about their restoration where this would help bring about urban regeneration;*
- *take account of the landscape context and setting of buildings and settlements; of building materials; and of the patterns of fields, hedgerows and walls that distinguish one area from another.*

Policy EC 1: Economic Development

Local authorities, the SWRDA, local economic partnerships and other agencies should support the sustainable development of the regional economy by:

- *positively promoting and encouraging new economic activity in the areas where it can bring the greatest economic and social benefits and make the greatest contribution to reducing regional disparities in prosperity;*
- *accommodating continued economic development in sustainable locations in the more prosperous north and east of the region and seeking to develop beneficial economic linkages between these areas and areas to the west whose economies have performed less well;*
- *ensuring that the region's unique environmental and cultural assets are maintained, enhanced and utilised to attract and develop business activity;*
- *developing the skills and abilities of the region's people by improving access to training, education and employment opportunities.*

Policy RE5: Management and Transportation of Waste

In order to achieve sustainable waste management (the Best Practicable Environmental Options) in the region, waste planning, disposal and collection authorities, the Environment Agency and waste management and water companies should cooperate to:

- *Establish a mix of waste recovery methods e.g. recycling, composting, energy recovery etc, regionally and sub-regionally, that will reduce reliance on landfill and will avoid creating over-reliance on any one method or facility.*
- *Pursue the following regional targets:*
    - *Recycle or compost at least 30% of household waste by 2010; and, 33% by 2015.*
    - *Recover value from 45% of municipal waste by 2010; and 67% by 2015.*
    - *Reduce landfilling of biodegradable municipal waste to 75% of the*
    - *1995 production level by 2010; and 50% by 2013.*
    - *Reduce landfilling of industrial and commercial waste to 85% of the 1998 level by 2005.*
- *Give priority to the provision of waste management facilities that will recover value from waste at or near the PUAs. Those facilities should take account of waste management requirements in the PUA (s) concerned and its neighbouring county areas and should be planned to contribute to the achievement of the regional targets above, in respect of the urban area(s) and its hinterland.*
- *Ensure that sub-regional requirements are taken into account in structure and waste local plans and in waste planning decisions. Structure or (where appropriate) waste local plans should propose targets for the provision of value recovery capacity among participating waste planning authorities. Provision at PUAs and at other urban areas should take the waste management requirements of their neighbouring county areas into account.*

Policy RE 6: Energy Generation and Use

Local authorities, energy suppliers and other agencies should:

- *support and encourage the region to meet the national targets for:a 12.5% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by 2008-2012 and a 20% reduction (from 1990 levels) in carbon dioxide emissions by 2010;*
- *a minimum of 11-15% of electricity production to be from renewable energy sources by 2010.*
- *encourage and promote the greater use of renewable energy sources, including community-based projects, such as Combined Heat and Power and Community Heating and their integration into more energy efficient new build or redevelopment proposals;*
- *have full regard to the recommendations and detailed background information contained in the report "Renewable energy assessments and targets for the South West" (GOSW APRIL 2001).*

Development Plans should:

- *specify the criteria against which proposals for renewable energy projects will be assessed, balancing the benefits of developing more sustainable forms of energy generation against the environmental impacts, in particular on national and international designated sites;*
- *promote energy conservation measures through policies guiding the design, layout and construction techniques of new development proposals.*

3. Methodology

3.1 Overall Approach

The overall approach to the survey is described in chapter 1. The following section provides a detailed description of the methodology followed for each discipline in undertaking their respective topic assessments as required for each site. Each methodology was confirmed in discussion with the client to confirm that they addressed the key issues that would support the selection of sites for the suggested waste development use or uses.

In all cases, when the assessments identified that additional tasks, outside the scope of this report, would be required before robust statements could be made on potential impacts, recommendations for further surveys and investigations have been provided.

Site specific potential mitigation measures are also reported. Without detailed construction or development proposals these have been devised in outline only. However, where feasible and appropriate, they include the means by which development can be accommodated at each site alleviating or minimising adverse affects on the cultural heritage resource.

All findings were entered into an established report template.

3.2 Cultural Heritage

Thirteen of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of cultural heritage issues. A list of these sites can be found in table **Appendix A**.

The aims of the cultural heritage assessments are to:

- Identify, describe and characterise the cultural heritage resource at each site;
- Assess the potential for development at each site to affect buried archaeological remains;
- Identify the potential impacts of development at each site on the cultural heritage resource;
- Identify any further work required to better understand potential impacts;
- Propose potential mitigation measures;

The assessments therefore aim to address all known and potential cultural heritage resources that may be affected by potential development including Scheduled Monuments, archaeological sites, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, unlisted buildings of historic or architectural value, and the wider historic landscape.

No Registered Historic Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, World Heritage Sites or candidate World Heritage Sites are likely to be affected by potential development at any of the thirteen sites.

For each of the thirteen sites a study area with a 500m radius has been adopted. These study areas extend 500m from the edge of the potential site boundaries.

The assessments conformed to the Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (2008)*.

Data from the following sources served to provide the baseline to inform each assessment:

- Wiltshire County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) for known archaeological sites and findspots. Wiltshire County Archaeologist and conservation representatives were also consulted for additional background information including details on areas of any areas of high archaeological potential; the locations of Conservation Areas, unlisted buildings of local historical and architectural importance; and important historic landscape character areas;
- The National Monuments Record (NMR) for Listed Buildings and historic and modern air photos;
- MAGIC (Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside) website for other designated assets comprising World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest;

- Envirocheck for Historical Ordnance Survey mapping;
- Information, where available, on ground disturbance associated with current structures, and geotechnical data;
- A site visit to each site (undertaken during March and April; 2010).

The collection and interpretation of the baseline information allowed for the production of gazetteers of cultural heritage assets within the study areas for each site. These assets are also depicted on a figure for each site; cross-referenced to the gazetteer by unique cultural heritage asset numbers.

Although the exact nature of development at each site is currently undefined, for the purposes of these assessments an assumption was made that future development would involve ground disturbing works; and that these ground disturbing works would have the potential to damage or remove any surviving important buried archaeological remains.

Also for the purposes of this assessment it was assumed that development would involve the construction of new structures or buildings at the sites, or the replacement of existing structures and buildings; and that this form of development could adversely affect the fabric and setting of important historic buildings and surviving historic landscapes within and close to the sites.

An understanding of the cultural heritage resource and an assumption of the likely development at each site allowed for an assessment of potential impacts to be reported.

Industry standard mitigation measures comprise the sensitive design of development, such that it is located away from known cultural heritage assets, avoiding adverse physical impact or adverse impact on settings, including the use of screening; and archaeological excavation or historic building recording in advance of, or during, construction activities.

Details of the thirteen site assessments can be found at Appendix A.

3.3 Landscape and Visual Impact

Forty-two of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of Landscape and Visual Impact assessments, of which thirty-one were appraised previously in 2006, for these, the previous survey findings were reviewed and updated as necessary. For the remaining 11 sites the landscape and visual assessment methodology followed a 4 stage process as follows:-

Stage 1 – Desk Study

A review of the available mapped and photographic information, county and national landscape planning policy together with gathering relevant information on landscape designations from Magic and other on-line sources.

From this a check list was made to inform and guide the site survey stage for each site.

Stage 2 – Consultation

Consultations were held with Natural England and with the relevant Local Authority Landscape team. Feedback was collected and fed back into the overall assessment.

Stage 3 – Site Survey

Each site was visited by two landscape architects (one senior and one junior) in line with the Landscape Institute EIA best practice guidance. The site survey would provide local data to support the desk study baseline landscape and character description, review potential landscape impacts, identify key visual receptors and consider mitigation options. In addition a photographic record was taken for reference purposes.

The photographic record comprised a series of digitally photomerged panoramic images of the site comprising photographs taken with a 50mm lens Digital SLR camera to represent the typical human perspective. These images were used to illustrate the existing character and condition of the sites, as well as identify potential visual receptors and give an indication of the degree of

exposure they would have to views of the proposals. The photographic record of the sites is included in Appendix F of the report.

Stage 4 – Reporting

For each site, the results of the earlier stages were reported using the standard pro-forma report. Each report covered the following issues, taking account of the identified potential uses for the site:

- Baseline Landscape Condition
- Landscape Character and Designations
- Potential Landscape Impacts
- Key Visual Receptors
- Potential Visual Impacts
- Mitigation Measures

3.4 Noise

Thirty eight of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of noise. The aim of the site noise appraisals was to provide the client with a broad overview of any noise issues that may affect development of the site for the use proposed.

The appraisals were carried out in accordance with BS 4142: 1997, Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas;

Each site was visited on a weekday and an appropriate sample location for noise monitoring. Was identified taking into account site and local topography, and understanding of the location of the nearest noise sensitive receptors. Where a large area was potentially shown for the facility we assumed that the facility siting would be adjusted to more favourably parts of the site.

Each monitoring exercise took the form of a series of 3 consecutive 5-minute measurements at one position during the working day. The following parameters were measured and recorded:

LAeq, LMax, LMin, LA10, LA90,

Weather conditions were noted, and no measurements were taken during periods of rain, fog, or when windspeeds in the locality exceed 5m/s. All major noise sources were noted for each of the measurement periods.

All monitoring equipment had been reference calibrated to an accredited source within the previous 2 years. As a precautionary measure on-site calibration was carried out before and after each measurement exercise, and any drift in the calibrated level was recorded. All monitoring equipment was tripod mounted at a height between 1.2 and 1.5 metres above local ground level in order to obtain the ‘free field’ reading.

The topographical features of the site and surroundings and the location of the nearest noise sensitive receptors (NSRs) were identified as well as any other significant features that may affect noise propagation.

A synoptic report was produced detailing the findings of the site visit including copies of all noise monitoring records. The findings were informed taking an account of potential noise mitigation measures that might be implemented to minimise the effect of noise arising from the proposed site development on the locality and an expressed opinion on the general viability of the site operating with the suggested mitigation.

3.5 Air Quality and Odour

Scope of Works

In the original 2006 assessment, a number of sites were excluded from the desk based survey due to the absence of air quality management areas (AQMAs), designated ecological sites, residential areas and other sensitive receptors in the near vicinity. Since carrying out this work, it

is possible that there have been changes within the individual study areas i.e. new AQMAs declared, new residential developments built, new ecological sites identified. As such some of the sites not previously assessed may now require consideration. Thirty three of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of Air Quality and Odour.

A pragmatic level of assessment was undertaken, proportionate to the requirements of the planning process at this stage, acknowledging that certain specific requirements cannot be meaningfully addressed without detailed design information. The assessment involved a 2 stage approach:-

In the first stage a desk study was undertaken to determine current air quality conditions and issues in the vicinity of each site. With reference to ODPM Mineral Planning Guidance 2 - Annex 1 (Dust), the detailed study area for each site extended to 1km from the anticipated site boundary. Data relevant to air quality conditions in each study area were compiled to show:

- Surrounding landuse;
- Potentially sensitive receptors (human population and designated ecological sites);
- Air Quality Management Areas;
- Ambient levels of local air pollutants NO2 and PM10 (using NETCEN background data);
- Flows of traffic on major roads (derived from AADF counts held by Department for Transport);
- Existing industrial sources of air pollutants (from local authority and Environment Agency inventories);
- Existing minerals, waste and wastewater treatment sites (to indicate potential cumulative impacts); and
- Significant topographic features that may affect pollutant dispersion.

The information from his desk study was used to determine the sensitivity and environmental acceptability of each site in terms of local air quality and odour. This enabled any sites considered to have potential air quality issues to be identified for the second stage assessment.

The detailed second stage assessment of those sites identified as requiring air quality assessment was confined to 500 metres (the area in which the greatest air quality impacts are likely to occur) and included:

- Discussion of baseline conditions within 500 metres of site boundary including proximity to AQMAs and background concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and PM10;
- Identification of sensitive receptors (including residential properties, schools, hospitals and nursing homes) within 500 metres of the site boundary;
- Discussion of likely changes in air quality within 200 metres of route corridors based on existing traffic flows and the likely changes due to waste site usage (where such data are available); and
- Consideration of odour, dust and bioaerosol issues specific to the potential future use of the site.
- Generic mitigation measures to reduce the potential for nuisance or human health issues to arise will be recommended as appropriate.
- An analysis was undertaken to indicate risk of exposure at identified receptors to emissions from the site.

3.6 Transport

Forty five of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment for Transport. The following tasks were undertaken for each of the sites which were categorised as follows:

- Rural sites – Considered unlikely to have traffic capacity related issues. The main issues were likely to be related to residential amenity, severance, road widths and local access;
- Urban sites – These sites are considered more likely to have highway capacity issues particularly if they have significant trip generation (employee and public use – e.g. Household Recycling sites).

For each site, the likely route of HGV and vehicular traffic to the freight network was identified. This exercise involved GIS analysis and a review of the local freight route network. The network included:

- Strategic Motorway;
- Strategic Lorry Route;
- Local Lorry Route; and
- 'Other' Lorry Route

For the purposes of the assessments it has been considered that access for HGVs should be made via the nearest available strategic lorry route, then by a designated local lorry route (where available). 'Other' lorry routes were only deemed appropriate where it was essential to gain access.

Where available and when considered appropriate information from the previous traffic assessment carried out in 2006 was used for comparison purposes. Where traffic data was not available engineering judgement was used to estimate traffic levels.

Data regarding the trip generation of all potential waste facilities under consideration is not readily available from the TRICS database, therefore traffic generation of each potential site use was determined using:

- Collaboration with other members of the Atkins team who specialise in Waste Site studies;
- Consultation with the Local Authority Waste teams; and
- Experience of Transport Assessments to support planning applications for similar sites i.e:
  - Material Recovery Facilities (MRF);
  - Energy from Waste facilities (EfW);
  - Anaerobic Digestion Plants (AD);
  - Mechanical Biological Treatment Plants (MBT);
  - In-Vessel Composting facility (IVC);
  - Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC); and
  - Waste Transfer Stations (WTS).

Detailed site appraisals of each site were undertaken in order to validate the information previously collected and to obtain relevant information for the new sites. The site appraisals focused on the following issues:

- **Approximate road widths** –based on appropriate site measurements;
- **Highway visibility** – measured at proposed identified access points;
- **Impact on residential amenity** – for where it was considered a potential material impact in terms of visual effect and severance;
- **Highway capacity and design standards** – to accommodate the type of vehicle (HGV etc) and quantity of traffic;
- **Impact on non motorised users** – assessed for the local highway network in terms of cycle, walking and equestrian users;

Waste facilities of a certain type and scale can generate significant employee trip generation and where considered appropriate Accession software was used to understand their accessibility by public transport.

A highway mitigation assessment was undertaken, based on the outputs from the desktop study and site investigation tasks. Mitigation measures were determined based on the most practicable use of the site in terms of highway impact. Indicative layouts were provided for sites where an entirely new site access was proposed (not where a modification to an existing access was identified). The layouts showed the most appropriate location for the access and the likely standard of access required to accommodate potential traffic volumes in relation to DMRB standards.

A qualitative assessment of the type and cost of mitigation on the local highway network is provided where practicable. The assessment of the necessary type and cost of mitigation is based on engineering judgement (junction capacity modelling has not been undertaken)

3.7 Water Quality / Environment

Thirty five of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of Water Quality/ Environment. The aim of the Water Quality Environment appraisals was to provide a broad overview of how a future waste development would interact with the water environment and whether adequate provision is available for both surface and foul drainage in the area.

A Phase 1 (Desk Study) for each location was provided as follows:

The following data sources were interrogated to identify and characterise the geology, hydrology, hydrogeology, contamination and surface water and drainage management/capacity at each location:-

- Landmark Envirocheck Report from the Landmark Information Group. The report includes site centred historical and current maps at 1:10,560, 1:10,000, 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales, together with outputs from initial interrogation of electronic databases maintained by the Regulators. The report provides historical maps, locations of surface water courses, surface water quality, groundwater vulnerability maps, designations and source protection zones, surface and groundwater abstractions, discharge consents to land, surface water and groundwater, Environmental Permits including landfill sites, ecological designations, environmental permits and authorisations, recorded pollution incidents and contemporary trade directories;
- Current topographic Ordnance Survey maps;
- Published geological and hydrogeological maps and copies of any relevant archive borehole records held by the British Geological Survey;
- Reference to the Environment Agency and Natural England websites.

The local water and drainage companies were consulted as to spare capacity in the surface water and foul drainage network in the area, together with pending upgrades. However, no information was forthcoming because the plans at each site are not yet defined.

Results of these investigations were assessed for each site to establish each site's environmental setting, using a preliminary conceptual site model (CSM) based on the source-pathway-receptor linkages. This took into account potential impacts on:

- Groundwater (quality and recharge);
- Surface water (quality, flow and flooding);
- Conservation designations related to the water environment;
- Infrastructure (impacts to foul and surface water systems).

Reporting of each waste site assessment was presented in standard format, and consisted of a table summarising the desk study findings, implications and recommendations.

A summary paragraph was also provided reflecting the overall outcome of the initial screening to indicate for each site the environmental suitability using the following categories:

- Few / no significant issues identified – progress waste site to next stage of assessment
- Several / potentially significant issues identified – review further assessment requirements of waste site
-

Many / serious issues identified – review further assessment requirements of waste site.

3.8 Contaminated Land

Eight of the fifty-two potential sites were identified as requiring detailed assessment of contaminated land issues. These were considered in conjunction with the water environment. The aim of the site contamination appraisals was to provide the client with a broad overview of any contamination issues, and in particular to assess the relationship between proposed waste uses for the sites concerned with any recorded history of potentially contaminative use(s) in the local vicinity, to ensure pollutant linkages are not exacerbated or created.

A desk study was undertaken to identify and characterise the geology, ground conditions and potential for land contamination at each location using the following sources.

- Landmark Envirocheck Report from the Landmark Information Group. The report included site centred historical and current maps at 1:10,560, 1:10,000, 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales, together with outputs from initial interrogation of electronic databases maintained by the Regulators. The report also provided historical maps, locations of surface water courses, surface water quality, flood plain data, groundwater vulnerability maps, designations and source protection zones, surface and groundwater abstractions, discharge consents to land, surface water and groundwater, waste management licences and landfill sites, ecological designations, environmental permits and authorisations, recorded pollution incidents and contemporary trade directories;
- Current topographic Ordnance Survey maps;
- Published geological and hydrogeological maps and copies of any relevant archive borehole records held by the British Geological Survey;
- Reference to the Environment Agency, MAGIC and Natural England websites;
- aerial photographs;

The results of the desk study were assessed for each site to establish its environmental setting, including potential sources of contamination and sensitive receptors. Reporting of each waste site assessment was presented in standard format, and consisted of a table summarising the desk study findings, implications and recommendations.

No site visits were undertaken specifically for the contamination assessments.

4. Conclusions

4.1 Conclusions

Atkins have undertaken the assessments of 52 potential waste sites for the following specialist fields:

- Landscape / Visual Impact
- Air quality and Odour
- Water environment
- Noise
- Cultural heritage
- Contaminated land
- Transport

The surveys and assessments generate detailed baseline information that will be used to provide a robust and credible evidence base to support the suggested waste site allocations. In addition to the detailed site assessments identifying the key land-use and environmental issues related to promoting the various waste uses, where appropriate, any mitigation and/or compensation measures likely to be required to ensure such development could be facilitated will be identified.

The level of detail to which the surveys and assessments have been carried out satisfy this aim but only allow for two broad conclusions. The first is that the site cannot support the proposed development in terms of that particular subject area. Alternatively, the conclusion is that the specific design, layout and methods of operation are not known and, as such, the proposed development may be acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation. Examples of such mitigation are provided within this report but should not be regarded as an exhaustive list until more detail is known when a planning application comes forward.

The approach to the detailed site assessment with respect to each of the environmental considerations is described in Chapter 3 which set outs the method statements that have been prepared with reference to the Schedule of Requirements set out in the Request for Quotation and relevant standards and guidance on good practice for each specialist area.

Individual proposals will have to satisfy all other material considerations and policy requirements at the planning application stage. The survey and assessment conclusions are summarised by area in **Table 4.1 – 4.5** below.

The majority of sites are shown as acceptable with appropriate mitigation but five sites have been deemed to be incapable of mitigation on noise grounds or the mitigation measures to be employed reduce the area of the site available for development to a size considered unviable for the proposed use. These sites are;

- Garden Estates, Devizes (Site Ref E2), Materials Recovery Facility/Waste Transfer Station and Local Recycling.
- Broadway, Market Lavington (Site Ref E6), Small materials recovery facility, waste transfer station or local scale recycling.
- Harnham Business Park Salisbury (Site Ref S3), Materials Recovery Facility/Waste Transfer Station and Local Recycling.
- Maidments Skip Hire (Site Ref S4), Swallowcliffe. Local Scale recycling, materials recovery facility, waste transfer station.

- Transfer Bridges Industrial Estate, Swindon (Site Ref SW5), Materials Recovery Facility/Waste Transfer Station and Local Recycling.

In order to assess a given site's suitability for development in noise terms, calculations have been undertaken based on information about the proposed activities, supplied by the client, and representative empirical data based on Atkins' previous experience for the noise levels of these proposed activities. This, combined with a background noise survey, allows indicative conclusions to be drawn about the sites suitability for the uses proposed, in terms of the resulting noise impact.

Owing to the lack of detailed design assumptions have had to be made as to the equipment type and location. The worst case scenario would be that the equipment is open to the elements and situated on the boundary of the site.

Noise calculations have been undertaken for the worst case scenario, whereby background noise level measurements have been taken at the most sensitive receiver in the vicinity of the site (the location which was deemed to be quietest), and initially assuming that any plant on the site is positioned on the boundary of the site where it is in closest proximity to this most sensitive receiver. Distance attenuation has been based on the plan distance between this location and the most sensitive receiver with ground attenuation effects being ignored.

The recommendations are, therefore, on the basis of the supplied information and the assumptions set out in the report. In the event that the detailed design and enclosure/location of the plant and equipment on a specific site suggest that noise levels are acceptable at noise sensitive locations this will need to be demonstrated at the planning application stage.

Further sites which have been deemed to be incapable of mitigation or deliverable on Traffic and Highway grounds. These sites are;

- West Hill Farm, Collingbourne Ducis(Site Ref E10), Materials Recovery Facility/Waste Transfer Station, Composting (C), Inert Waste Recycling/Transfer and Local Recycling.
- G&S Patios, Seend, Melksham (Site Ref E12), Small materials recovery facility, waste transfer station or local scale recycling.

The site's suitability in traffic and highway terms has been assessed for the proposed intensification of uses. The assessment has been undertaken based on information about the proposed activities, supplied by the client, a site survey, and assumptions based on Atkins' previous experience of the type of activities proposed. The assessments give consideration to individual site constraints and potential mitigation measures required to address the identified limitations of the access and safety issues. The recommendation is therefore made on the basis of the information supplied and the assumptions set out in the report.

The assessment have also identified a number of significant issues at the following sites, these will require further consideration with thorough arguments and mitigation at planning application stage;

- Leafield Industrial Estate, Corsham (Site Ref N13), Household recycling centre, materials recovery facility/ waste transfer Station, local scale recycling. In transport/traffic terms the vehicles will have to pass significant numbers of residential properties and means of dealing with the impact on amenity of those properties.
- Sarum Centre, Salisbury (Site Ref S5), Materials recovery facility/ waste transfer Station, local scale recycling. The potential for impact on the historic character of the area will require special attention at planning application stage.
- Employment Allocation, Mere (Site Ref S9), Household recycling centre, materials recovery facility/ waste transfer station, local scale recycling. There would be a significant erosion of the rural character of the area. Not deleting this site is predicated upon the existing allocation for employment uses which may not receive consent on similar landscape grounds and this site is weak as a result.

- Former Imerys Quarry, Quidhampton (Site Ref S10), Household recycling centre, materials recovery facility/ waste transfer station, local scale recycling and local scale waste treatment. The proposed site is considered appropriate for small scale MRF/WTS uses however the assessment recommends that the site is not used for facilities that will generate high volumes of traffic such as a HRC facility.
- Northacre Trading Estate, Westbury (Site Ref W3), Materials recovery facility/ waste transfer station, local scale recycling and waste treatment (Energy from Waste, MBT, AD, IVC). The judgement expressed is that the landscape impact is dependent on the urban fringe location and the presence of residential properties. The site is not deleted from consideration but this view is predicated on the assumption that the site would be developed under its' current employment allocation
- West Ashton Employment Allocation, Trowbridge (Site Ref W7), Materials recovery facility/ waste transfer station, local scale recycling. The semi-enclosed rural floodplain character of the site would be significantly affected by the proposed development. The decision not to recommend this site for deletion is based on the assumption that the site will be developed for employment uses.

Table 4.1 - Summary of Conclusions by Site [North]

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
N1 Parkgate Farm, Purton	Landscape and Visual Impact	The relative visual and physical isolation of the site and presence of the adjacent railway and the existing landfill have eroded the landscape character such that the site has a moderate ability to accommodate change. The main visual impacts on surrounding farms and residences could be mitigated through sensitive site planning, the retention of existing planting (where possible) and screen planting.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Mitigation for dust, odour and bio-aerosols is recommended. Detailed assessment is recommended if residential premises remain within 250 m the assessment should account for the influence of Paven Hill (to the south) on local air flows. In any case, further assessment is recommended for bioaerosols and odour at receptors within 500 m.	N
	Transport	Access to the site is limited to Mopes Lane via the existing accommodation bridge, however, further investigation of the existing bridge structure of the rail track would be needed. Mitigation may also be required at the Cricklade Road / B4553 Packhorse Lane junction to improve safety.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening has identified the presence of a surface water course and a secondary aquifer. However, it is considered the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site. Further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, contamination assessment, and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N
N2	Landscape and	The site is currently a significant landscape detractor, sensitive site planning with low, single or double	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
Purton Brickworks Employment Area, Purton	Visual Impact	storey facilities in keeping with the rural style would have a minimal adverse impact. Therefore the site has a moderate ability to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on surrounding residences and farms, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	
	Noise	Based on current calculations the site is not deemed suitable to support all three uses simultaneously. However with careful sitting and use of mitigation measure the site is considered suitable for limited intensification of use ie only one of the possible uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences would be required on the eastern and southern boundaries	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high without mitigation. Measures to control emissions dust, odour and bioaeorosols should be required. Detailed assessment at properties surrounding site is recommended.	N
	Transport	Access to the site via New Road is not recommended as New Road and the New Road / Cricklade Road junction is considered unsuitable for HGV use. Therefore, access to the site is limited to Mopes Lane. Mitigation may also be required at the Cricklade Road / B4553 Packhorse Lane junction to improve safety.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there are proximate surface water features and potentially contaminating land uses on site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and a contamination assessment.	N
N3 Hill Resource Recovery Centre, Compton Bassett	Landscape and Visual Impact	Though occuping a semi-open setting, the existing condition of the site and immediate neighbouring uses and mitigation works already established it is likely that development here would have a minimal impact on the surrounding rural character; therefore the site has a medium ability to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on residences to the south and the adjacent bridleway could largely be mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. The facility should be sited as far away from the residential properties as practical and by at least 150m with mitigation measures such as acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences required on the north east and southern boundaries.	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high. Treatment extension to existing landfill may increase odour and bioaerosols at properties located in Lower Compton. Mitigation for dust, bioaerosols and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken to examine bioaerosoals if treatment works is an open process.	N
	Transport	This site is suitable, in traffic terms, for the proposed uses. It is recommended that consideration given to improvements be made to the site access road in the form of increased width if possible, or a more sufficient access management plan for the access road.	N
N4 Land East of HRC/ WTS at Stanton St Quintin	Landscape and Visual Impact	The proposed site generally flat, comprises a medium scale arable field, fully enclosed to the west, south and east by hedgerows with hedgerow trees. The isolated and enclosed setting the site has a high capacity to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on users travelling along the M4, could potentially be mitigated through screen planting.	N
	Noise	With mitigation this Greenfield site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. There is little or no screening to the residential property to the south east but with careful sitting the site is deemed suitable with respect to noise. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required and the facility should be sited towards the west of the site and at least 150m away from the residential property.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high without mitigation. Measures to control emissions of local air pollutants from combustion plant, and of dust, odour and bioaeorosols should be required. Detailed assessment is recommended.	N
	Transport	The site is located away from any residential areas which would mean the environmental impact would be minimal and has excellent access to the strategic freight network. There is potential to provide a suitable access into the site which would give adequate visibility. However, as capacity may be an issue, a ghost island right turn would be recommended to reduce any delays. Therefore it is concluded that this site would provide a suitable location for the proposed waste uses with consideration of the mitigation measures as set out in this report.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and liaison with the	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		Environment Agency.	
N5 Land West of HRC/ WTS at Stanton St Quintin	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its isolated and enclosed setting the site has a medium capacity to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on users travelling along the M4, could potentially be mitigated through screen planting and the impacts on residential properties to the south could be mitigated through careful site planning.	N
	Transport	The site is located away from any residential areas which would mean the environmental impact would be minimal and has excellent access to the strategic freight network. There is potential to provide a suitable access into the site which would give adequate visibility. However, as capacity may be an issue, a ghost island right turn would be recommended to reduce any delays. Therefore it is concluded that this site would provide a suitable location for the proposed waste uses with consideration of the mitigation measures as set out in this report.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N
N6 Land North East of HRC/ WTS at Stanton St Quintin	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its isolated and enclosed setting the site has a high capacity to accommodate change. The main visual impact could be mitigated through boundary planting.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. With appropriate screening and positioning of the facility, the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the northern and western boundaries of the proposed facility. The facility needs to be located away from dwelling near the western portion of the site by at least 150m	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to high without mitigation. Measures to control emissions of dust, odour and bioaeorosols should be required. Detailed assessment of bioaerosols at property within 100m is recommended.	N
	Transport	The site is located in close vicinity to the strategic freight network, however there are issues concerning how access to the HGV Route Network will be gained due to the narrow road widths from/to the A429. Issues also exist with both potential access points	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		into the site. Access A is too narrow and would require third party land to widen to a suitable width to accommodate two way flows. Access B is also constrained and third party land may be required to widen Scotland Hill and improve the existing kerbed radius into the site. The opportunity to use both access points which are incorporated into a one way system could be investigated. In general the site has a number of transport issues that would need further investigation before being suitable for a waste facility.	
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N
N7 Parkgrounds Farm, Wooton Bassett	Cultural Heritage	Development of the site may impact on currently unrecorded remains associated with known and unknown sites of buried archaeological remains. A programme of archaeological field surveys could be undertaken to assess the nature, extent and significance of any surviving remains. The two archaeological sites recorded in the western part of the site should be subject to archaeological evaluation in advance of any proposed land extraction in this area. Further mitigation may be required depending on the outcome of the evaluation. No mitigation will be required for the extant farmhouse or associated agricultural buildings. The Scheduled Monument recorded within the Study Area c.400m south of the site is screened by the line of the railway M4 motorway. There would be no affect on its setting. There would be no affect on the setting of the listed milestone c.500m north of the site. No mitigation is therefore required.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	The proximity of the M4 and the composting centre to the south of the site have degraded the landscape character of the area which strongly impacts on the site due to its exposed nature, this gives the site a poor landscape quality. Sensitive site planning and establishment of hedgerows and screen planting will improve the site enclosure allowing the site to accommodate change while minimising adverse landscape and visual impacts of development.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. There is little or no screening to the residential properties to north, but due to the size of the site with careful sitting the site is deemed to be suitable. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on all but the southern boundary. The site should be located a minimum of 150m from any residential dwellings.	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to high without mitigation. Mitigation for dust, odour and bioaerosols is recommended. Detailed assessment is recommended for bioaerosols and odour if the layout of the site is to include composting facilities within 250m of receptors; given the size of the site, there is potential for these activities to be located beyond 250m.	N
	Transport	The site is in a good location for access to the designated lorry routes which lead to the strategic freight network although vehicles will have to pass by a limited number of residential dwellings. The site access junction may require upgrading however the location of the access is suitable to provide good visibility at the access to the site. Overall the site is well placed to accommodate the proposed waste facilities with the appropriate mitigation measures.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
N8 Studley Grange Waste Management Facility, Wooton Bassett	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting and the undulating topography to the south, the site has a moderate ability to accommodate change without harm. The main visual impacts, on surrounding residences and farms, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting, as well as the creation of vegetated earth bunds to the site boundaries.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or is required the location of which will be dependent on where it is located and the facility is to be sited away from the western boundary and at least 150m from any residential dwelling	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to high (in-combination with existing landfill) without mitigation. Mitigation for dust and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken to examine cumulative odour and bioaerosol effects.	N
	Transport	The site is ideally placed to provide immediate access to the strategic freight network thus reducing any potential adverse environmental impacts on the	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		surrounding area. However, in order to provide adequate vehicular access to the site mitigation works would be required to provide improved visibility. Should a safety audit deem the visibility at the access unsuitable for the proposed uses, then an improved form of layout may be required.	
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment will be required for the flood risk to further determine the level of flood risk for the site and the appropriate mitigation measures.	N
N9 Barnground, South Cerney	Cultural Heritage	There are no heritage assets recorded on the WSMR, NMR, historic maps or aerial photographs within the site boundary. There is 1 Scheduled Monument (N9-h) within the study area, c.450m to the southeast of the site. The site has already been extensively disturbed by previous extraction and use. Although a number of archaeological features and finds have been identified within the study area, the potential for the presence of currently unrecorded archaeological deposits within the site is negligible. No further archaeological assessment is recommended. It is unlikely that mitigation for the impact on buried archaeological remains will be required. There would be no affect on the setting of the Scheduled Monument recorded c.450m southeast of the site. There are no historic buildings within the study area. Cultural heritage is therefore not considered a constraint to development.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	Though a relatively open landscape, the rolling topography of the site with a significant fall away to the south provides for an opportunity to develop the site minimal adverse impact on the local and surround character and visual receptors, therefore the site has a moderate ability to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on surrounding residences and farms, could potentially be mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	N
	Noise	There is little or no screening from the proposed site but due to the distances to the nearest existing residential, the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences would be required on the southern boundary if the nearest non residential building is converted into residential.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Barnground is located on Ashdown Road 600 metres west of South Cerney. There are no AQMAs, properties or ecological sites within 500 metres of this site. Consequently there will be negligible air quality impacts associated with this site.	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
	Transport	In conclusion, the proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures including improvements to the site access in terms of a ghost island right turn lane, signing and consideration to a reduction in the speed limit of the road.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
N10 Whitehills Industrial Estate	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting and the cutting in the topography into which the northern portion of the sits, the site has a moderate ability to accommodate change without harm. The main visual impacts, on surrounding residences and users, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting, as well as the creation of vegetated earth bunds to the north and west site boundaries.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. The site is on an existing industrial estate with residential properties to the south east. There is little or no screening to the residential properties but due to the size of the site with careful sitting and screening the site is deemed to be suitable from a noise perspective. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required depending on the siting of the facilities. The facilities should be sited as far away from the south eastern boundary as practical and by at least 150m.	N
	Transport	There are a number of issues which would need to be addressed before the site is considered suitable for a waste facility. In particular, the environmental impact associated with an increased number of HGVs, as well as access to the site via the Whitehill Lane / Bath Road junction is an area for concern. However it is considered that with mitigation measures the site would be suitable for the proposed uses.	N
N11 Bumpers Farm industrial Estate	Noise	The site is on an existing industrial estate with residential dwellings on the eastern and southern boundaries. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required dependent on the location of the facility. The facilities should be sited as far away from the southern and eastern boundary as practical and at a minimum distance of 150m.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Mitigation for dust and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		not be necessary.	
	Transport	The site is ideally located, in transport terms, for local residents to use the site, whilst providing very good links for HGVs to access the wider strategic highway network without impacting on local settlements. The proposed site is considered appropriate, in transport terms, for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures as set out in this report. Capacity/impact assessments of the local highway network will be required as part of a Transport Assessment to confirm no other mitigation measures are required.	N
N12 Thingley Junction, Chippenham	Landscape and Visual Impact	The site is situated within an open area, there are very few immediate receptors which limit the potential impact to any change in use of the site. Along with mitigation and planning of the site the visual receptors to the site would not suffer any adverse visual impacts. The main visual impacts could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive facility design and screen planting.	N
	Noise	The site is a brown field site with a caravan site on its northern boundary. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required. The facilities should be sited as far away from the northern boundary as possible and at least 150m.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low without mitigation. Some mitigation for dust and odour is recommended. Further assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The proposed re-development of the site can be accommodated in traffic terms with little impact on the wider highway network or local residential settlements. However, extensive physical works to the site access will be required. In addition some local widening would be required along the unnamed road linking the site to the A4.The proposed site is considered appropriate, in transport terms, for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures recommended.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment and surface water management plan.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer, a SPZ 2 and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site including landfilling that could gives rise to	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a contamination assessment.	
N13 Leafield Industrial Estate, Corsham	Landscape and Visual Impact	Although the site has several visual receptors in close proximity, its ability to accept change remains good due to the current character and use of the site. Through careful site planning and building control, along with screen planting, these views should be mitigated.	N
	Noise	The site is on an existing industrial estate with residential properties on the southern and northern boundary. There is little or no acoustic screening to the residential properties but with careful sitting the area is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences may be required, the location of which would depend on the sitting of the facility. The facilities should be sited as far away from the southern and northern boundaries as practical and at least 150m from any residential dwelling.	N
	Transport	Having considered the advantage and constraint, the site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with the implementation of mitigation measures. It is recommended that access for HGVs is restricted to the north through signing and routing agreements. Access for light vehicles from the south is deemed acceptable. A transport Assessment will be required for this site to determine the impact of traffic generated by the various proposed uses on the highway network.	N
N14 Porte Marsh Industrial Estate, Calne	Cultural Heritage	The site lies adjacent to a Scheduled Monument, the earthwork remains of a deserted Medieval village. Previous archaeological evaluation within and immediately surrounding the site has revealed the presence of deposits and the potential for further discoveries relating to the adjacent medieval settlement and possible Romano-British activity. Preference should be given to locating waste facilities within – or on the site of - an existing building. This would eliminate the potential for impact on archaeological deposits or setting on the adjacent Scheduled Monument. Further archaeological evaluation would be required where new build is required. Development should be avoided within the existing vacant plot to the north of the site to avoid impacting on the setting of the Scheduled Monument. Should this not be feasible, new build should be screened by new planting located within the plot and not on the site boundary (otherwise this may further impact in buried archaeological deposits).	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the	N

Site	Survey Topic	Conclusions	Site Deleted Y/N
		proposed uses. However, further investigation is required into the impact the traffic will have on Calne town centre on the A4, and to assess capacity on the roundabouts of the A3102 and A4 in the immediate vicinity.	

Table 4.2 - Summary of Conclusions by Site [East]

E1 Castledown Business Park, Ludgershall	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its current open, semi-rural character, it would be difficult for the site to accommodate works without compromising the rural setting and open chalkland character of the landscape around Ludgershall. However, if the site is developed for business use, the residual impact of waste uses will be far less. Given the size of the site, with sensitive siting and vegetative screening, the proposals could have a negligible impact on school children, users of the A3026 and employees of the MoD depots to the north and south of the site.	N
	Noise	With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. The site is partially shielded by the railway and existing buildings, and is considered sufficiently large for a facility to be sited away from residential and hence is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the eastern and southern boundaries of the facility dependant on its sitting. The facilities should be sited as far away from the eastern boundary as practical and at least 150m away from any residential dwelling.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and a contamination assessment.	N
E2 Garden Estates, Devizes	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its partially enclosed setting and existing industrial character, the site could accommodate some change, although this would need to be managed carefully, due to the presence of residential properties to the east and open countryside to the west. The proposals would need to be located away from these visual receptors and planting screens and bunds used around the boundaries to protect the rural setting.	N
	Noise	The site is an existing industrial estate with residential properties on the southern and eastern boundaries. Although placing all the activities inside a building would provide mitigation to this facility, the intensification of use associated with access traffic would make this site unsuitable. With mitigation the	N

		site is not deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low without mitigation. No requirement for further assessment.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the mitigation measures as set out in this report, to ensure the site access is fit for purpose.	N
E3 Hopton industrial Estate, Devizes	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its existing industrial character, some parts of this site could accommodate change, although care would need to be taken to avoid harming the rural character of the adjacent AONB. The main visual impacts would be on employees and visitors to the Industrial estate, and new facilities would need to be discretely sited to minimise visual impact. A structure of large trees and hedgerows would help to mitigate visual impact. Consideration will need to be given to the visual impact on local footpaths. To mitigate visual impact on walkers on-site or off-site planting could screen views.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the possible parking related mitigation measures.	N
E4 Nursteed Road Employment Allocation, Devizes	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the proximity of the site to surrounding residential properties and its urban fringe character the potential views into the site from the surrounding receptors, careful site planning and buffer planting will be required to ensure that potential views of the development are prevented.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the mitigation measures to ensure the site access is fit for purpose.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and a contamination assessment of the site.	N
E5 Wiltshire Waste Tinkersfield Farm, Monument Hill Devizes	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its enclosed setting and existing waste-dominated character, the site is well placed to accommodate change. Site planning should avoid the loss of mature hedgerows and trees around and within the site, but make use of the existing earth bunds to continue screening views. Care will need to be taken when designing the site entrance to ensure that views into the site from the A342 and Ridgecroft are not opened up.	N
	Noise	The site is currently occupied by a waste site and is partially shielded from residential properties by the A342 and existing bunding. With mitigation the site is	N

		deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences on the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the facility is required and the facility should be sited towards the middle of the site area, with a minimum of 150m to the nearest residential dwelling.	
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to high without mitigation. Mitigation for dust, bioaerosols and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the mitigation measures to ensure the site access is fit for purpose.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that there are watercourses that enter the site and the site is on a Primary Aquifer. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there is a history of potentially contaminating land use on the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required includes a contamination assessment.	N
E6 Broadway Employment Allocation, Market Lavington	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting and existing industrial character, the site could accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on residences on Broadway Ledge and the footpath to the south of the site, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting. Site planning should avoid the loss of the lane with hedge banks that runs through the site.	N
	Noise	The site is an existing industrial estate with residential properties to the north of the site. Due to the proximity of residential dwellings the site is highly unlikely to be considered suitable for the intensification with the proposed uses. Placing all the activities inside a building would this facility possibly be considered suitable, but the intensification of use from access traffic may make this site unsuitable. With mitigation the site is not deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	Y
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low without mitigation. Mitigation for dust is recommended. Further assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the	N

		mitigation measures to ensure the site access and off-site highway network is fit for purpose.	
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there is a history of potentially contaminating land use on the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required includes a contamination assessment.	N
E7 Salisbury Road Business Park, Marlborough	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting and existing commercial character, the site could accommodate change, especially away from the A346. The main visual impacts, on users of this road, and, during the winter, residents to the north, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses however consideration of the appropriate location of the site within the business park and HGV routing should be considered.	N
E8 Salisbury Road Business Park, Pewsey	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its existing commercial character, the site could accommodate change with little change to the visual amenity of the area, although sensitive site planning would have to ensure that existing residential properties on the site would not be adversely affected. It is also likely that additional planting would be needed along the A345 frontage of the site and along the northern boundary to screen views from the river valley.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there is a water course adjacent to the site and the site is on a Primary Aquifer. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, contamination assessment, and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N
E9 Everleigh Waste Management Facility	Cultural Heritage	There are no heritage assets recorded on the WSMR, NMR, historic maps or aerial photographs within the site boundary. There is one Scheduled Monument (E9-e) within the study area, c.450m to the northeast of the site.Although a number of archaeological features and finds have been identified within the study area, the potential for the presence of currently unrecorded archaeological deposits within the site is low. No further archaeological assessment is recommended. It is unlikely that mitigation for the impact on buried archaeological remains will be required. Providing that the existing screening plantation remains in place, and the development does not exceed the current height of the tree level, the setting of the Scheduled Monument located	N

		c.450m northwest of the site will not be impacted upon by development within the site boundary.	
	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting and existing waste-dominated character, the site could accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on users of the lane and the footpath to the south of the site, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that the site is underlain by a Primary Aquifer and there is a risk of groundwater flooding. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
E10 West Hill Farm, Collingbourne Ducis	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its setting within the surrounding undulating landscape, the site could accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on users of the byway and the road on the edge of the site could be mitigated through site planning and additional screen planting to the shelter planting that is already present.	N
	Transport	The study has identified significant constraints which could be overcome with the mitigation measures set out in the report. Such measure would include the access to the site be restricted to/from the west through the provision of environmental weight limits and/or routeing agreements with the site operator, improvements to the A342/Everleigh Road junction to include larger turning radii suitable to accommodate HGV traffic and ideally Everleigh Road would be widened to two lanes between the site access and the A342. However the likely cost of the improvements required suggests alternative sites may be more appropriate for the proposed uses. However, given the scale and nature of the potential uses, the high capital cost of the improvement works required will be a significant impediment to the deliverabilty of the site. Therefore, it is recommended the site is not consider further.	Y
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that a Primary Aquifer lies beneath the site and potentially contaminating farming activities at the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
E11 Pickpit Hill, Ludgershall	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures. These measures include the relocation of the access approximately 180m to the east which improves the visibility to the right whilst remaining within the boundary of the site and a dedicated right turn and consideration to the routeing of HGV traffic to the site	N

		is from/to the east via the A342 and the A303 and not through Tidworth.	
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that the site is on a Primary Aquifer and SPZ 2 and therefore there are potential groundwater contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment and a surface water management plan.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer, a SPZ 2 and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site including landfilling that could gives rise to potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a contamination assessment.	N
E12 G & S Patios, Seend, Melksham	Landscape and Visual Impact	Although the site is situated within a wide valley, through careful mitigation and planning of the site the visual receptors to the site would not suffer any adverse visual impacts. The main visual impacts could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive facility design and screen planting.	N
	Noise	The site is an existing waste transfer site with residential properties to the south and north. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for some of the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required to the south and the north of the facility. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable with respect to noise but, depending on the intensification of use, not for all three of the proposed uses.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is not considered appropriate for the proposed uses even with consideration of the mitigation measures identified. The likely cost of the improvements required, the fact that the mitigation measures do not remove all issues and actually introduce further issues and the potential land constraints to implement some of the improvements suggests alternative sites are considerably more appropriate for the proposed uses. In addition, unless significant improvements are made to the vertical and horizontal alignment of the nearby bridge at a substantial cost, significant safety issues will still be apparent at the site access(es) no matter what other improvements are made.	Y

Table 4.3 - Summary of Conclusions by Site [South]

S1 Solstice Business Park Amesbury	Cultural Heritage	Solstice Park has already been subject to extensive archaeological evaluation and excavation in advance of the development of the existing business and retail park developments. Given the scale of development, the potential for the presence of any archaeological deposits is negligible. The setting of the Scheduled Monument to the east of the site has already been screened from the existing development. Providing the height and mass of the new development does not exceed that of existing structures on the site, it will not affect the setting of the surrounding Scheduled Monuments. Cultural Heritage is therefore not considered a constraint to development.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	This is an extremely open site, forming part of a wider landscape praised for its sense of remoteness and strong rural character. Although not directly overlooked by residential properties, it is highly visible to users of the busy A303. Whilst woodland planting could help to mitigate the impacts of the proposals on landscape character and visual amenity, this would still erode the open, exposed character of the area. In assessing the effects of the proposals however, it is important to recognise that the land is allocated for employment use and will be developed in any event, thus reducing the overall effects. Such uses may be less industrial in character than a waste site however, careful consideration should be given to how such a facility could be suitably accommodated on this site.	N
S2 CB Skip Hire, St Thomas Farm, Salisbury	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its semi-enclosed setting and existing industrial character, the site could accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on residences on Broadway Ledge and the footpath to the south of the site, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting. Site planning should avoid the loss of the lane with hedgebanks that runs through the site.	N
	Noise	The site is well separated from local housing, with the exception of the owner's house, and already contains similar noise sources. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the southern and eastern boundary of the facility. With mitigation and assuming the owner's house is within the same planning unit, due to increased traffic on the access route, the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to high without mitigation. Dust, bioaerosol (with composting) and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken if the site is intended for composting.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates the presence of the nearby River Avon SSSI and a Primary Aquifer and SPZ 1 which lies beneath the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the	N

		design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and liaison with the Environment Agency.	
S3 Harnham Business Park Salisbury	Landscape and Visual Impact	With its semi-enclosed setting at the foot of a low scarp and with some mature trees on its northern boundary, and its existing industrial character, the site could accommodate some change. However, due to its semi-rural location and the relatively high number of sensitive visual receptor groups in close proximity to the site, particular care will need to be taken when siting and screening any facility here, to mitigate visual impact.	N
	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial estate with a residential estate located on the eastern boundary with a childrens nursery in close proximity to the industrial estate. Adequate mitigation due to the proximity of residential units is not possible. The site is not deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise	Y
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low. Dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include the route to the site be signed from the west and enforced using routeing agreements with the site operator.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses within 1km of the site, a Primary Aquifer and potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised, plus a Surface Water Management Plan will be required. Further assessment and work that is required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
S4 Maidments Skip Hire, Swallowcliffe	Landscape and Visual Impact	This site is located in a relatively sensitive position, within an AONB and adjacent to elevated open farmland and a relatively busy A road. The presence of the garage building which is of some historical interest also adds to the character of the site. However, given that the site is already utilised for waste management purposes and that there are no high sensitivity visual receptors within the immediate vicinity of the site, the residual visual and landscape impacts could be negligible, so long as vegetation screens are provided and the site is carefully planned.	N
	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial unit with houses on the eastern and western boundaries. It is considered that the site, although used as a skip hire depot, would not be ideal for the intended	Y

		intensification of use. Any operations would need to be within a building but the increase in traffic movements associated with the intended uses would probably be unacceptable. Even with mitigation the site is deemed substandard for the intended uses with respect to noise.	
	Air Quality and Odour	The extension to the existing site would be considered to have negligible impacts on air quality given the current usage and lack of material environmental constraints.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for small scale MRF/WTS/LR uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include improved visibility through minor modifications to the boundary wall and vegetation at the site access.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water features in proximity, a Primary Aquifer underlies the site and there are potentially contaminating land uses on site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that would be required include a flood risk assessment and contamination assessment.	N
S5 Sarum Business Park Salisbury	Cultural Heritage	The Old Sarum Business Park site (S5) incorporates remains of one of the oldest working airfields in England. The 1918 workshop and 1935 headquarters buildings have been individually designated Grade II Listed Buildings. Old Sarum Airfield was designated a Conservation Area in 2007. Given the significance of the heritage assets within the site, no development should be permitted within the Conservation Area or within the curtilege or setting of the Listed Buildings. Development within the business park outside of the Conservation Area may be acceptable where it does not negatively impact upon the setting of the Listed Buildings. Development should not exceed the height or mass of the existing buildings. Given the extent of recorded archaeological deposits within the study area (including the line of a Roman road that defines the northern boundary of the site), further archaeological field evaluation is recommended to assess the potential for the presence and extent of survival of buried archaeological deposits. The one known Scheduled Monument within the study area (S5-i) lies 500m to the northeast of the site boundary and is screened from the site by a number of buildings. Development would not therefore affect the setting of the Scheduled Monument.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	The site is relatively large, and it is difficult to summarise potential impacts without further information on specific proposals. It is important that it has a relatively strong historic character, albeit dating to the 20th century and this should be protected. The site is also well used, with a large number of visual receptors, both on-site and within	N

		the surrounding countryside, which is very open in character. Whilst it is a brown-field site, it does not currently have a strong heavy-industry or waste-dominated character.	
	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial area with houses on the northern and eastern boundaries. It is considered that, due to the separation distance capable of being provided with careful sitting, the site is suitable for the intended uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the northern and eastern boundary depending on the facilities location within the site. Any facility needs to be sited a minimum separation distance of 100m from Bath Road and 120m from the residential properties to the east. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable with respect to noise.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses.	N
S6 Thorney Down WTS, Winterslow	Landscape and Visual Impact	Given that this site is well-concealed and already predominantly given over to use as a waste transfer station, there would be negligible landscape and visual impacts.	N
	Noise	The site is separated from the nearest residential property by the A30. The site is partially screened by the A30 and existing buildings and is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses with careful siting. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences to is required on the southern and eastern boundary of the facility. Any facility should be located at least 150m from any residential development. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Risks associated with potential uses for site are low and as such no further assessment is required.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water features in proximity a Primary Aquifer underlies the site and there are potentially contaminating land uses on site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised.Further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and a contamination assessment.	N
S7 Salisbury Road Industrial Estate, Downton	Cultural Heritage	There are no heritage assets recorded on the WSMR, NMR, historic maps or aerial photographs within the site boundary. The site has already been extensively developed for commercial use. The study area encompasses part of the Downton Conservation Area which contains a high number of Grade II and Grade II* Listed Buildings. Providing that the proposed development does not exceed the height and mass of the existing structures within the site and that the site	N

		remains screened by vegetation, the setting of the surrounding built heritage will not be affected, and no further mitigation will be required. Although a number of archaeological features and finds have been identified within the study area (part of which south and east of the site is designated an Area of Special Archaeological Significance), the potential for the presence of currently unrecorded archaeological deposits within the site is low. No further archaeological assessment is recommended. No mitigation for the impact on archaeological deposits will be required.	
	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its semi-enclosed setting and existing industrial character, the site could some accommodate change, however sensitive planning would be required to minimise adverse impacts on surrounding residential properties and existing users of the industrial estate. The rural floodplain character of the landscape to the east should be reflected in planting around new facilities to integrate them with their surroundings.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses however appropriate HGV routing should be considered to address the potential for adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the local villages. Junction capacity assessments will be required, particularly at the priority access to the estate where HRC uses in particular, may have an impact on capacity.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that the River Avon SSSI is in proximity, a Primary Aquifer underlies the site and there are some potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N
S8 Brickworth Quarry and Landfill	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its semi-enclosed wooded setting and existing quarried character, the site could accommodate change. The main visual receptor groups, walkers on nearby footpaths and drivers on the A36 are both already well screened, although this could be further enhanced with additional planting.	N
	Noise	The site is separated from the nearest residential property by the A36. The site is partially screened by the topography and is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses with careful sitting. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required depending on the facilities location and the facility should be sited as far away from the south east corner as practical, with a minimum separation of 150m from any residential properties. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended use with respect to noise.	N

	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low. Dust mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
S9 Employment Allocation, Mere	Landscape and Visual Impact	Compared to the majority of other sites, this is greenfield in character and to develop it for waste purposes would see a significant erosion of its rural character. Given that the site is allocated for employment use, however, it is likely that this character will change in any event. If the site was developed for business, and with careful siting of the proposed facilities away from the B3092 and adjacent industrial estate, and with the planting of additional screening vegetation, the residual adverse impact of the proposals would be slight - negligible.	N
	Noise	The site is adjacent to a residential property and existing industrial estate. With careful sitting away from the south east boundary the site is deemed to be suitable for the intended uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the eastern and southern boundaries of the facility. The facility should be sited towards to the west of the allocation area and no closer than 120m to the nearest residential property. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration is required of the mitigation measures to ensure the site access is fit for purpose. Further investigation will be required to assess the visibility from the proposed site access, whilst consideration of speed reduction measures for the B3092 may be necessary.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Primary Aquifer and SPZ 1 and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N

S10 Former Imerys Quarry, Quidhampton	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to its enclosed position within the landscape and limited views into the site caused by the undulating landform, this site could accommodate change. Minor mitigation measures may be required depending on the level of development. This would ensure the limited views into the site are retained.	N
	Noise	The site is a former quarry with residential dwellings to the north east, separated by Penning Road, and with residential dwellings to the south, separated by a railway and the A39. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the eastern and northern boundaries of the facility and the facility should be sited away from the eastern boundary, with a minimum separation distance of 150m between the proposed facilities and any residential dwelling. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	The risks associated with the potential uses of the site are low and only require minimal mitigation. No further assessment is required.	N
	Transport	It is not recommended that the site be used for facilities that will generate high volumes of traffic, notably a HRC facility that would be accessed by the public. The proposed site is considered appropriate for small scale MRF/WTS uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include a left in/left out arrangement be implemented with all access to the site gained from the west and all egress from the site to the east (towards Salisbury). It is recommended that speed reduction measures are implemented on the A36 and an assessment of the suitability of the bridge over the railway line to accommodate the proposed number of HGVs and to determine the need to signalise the bridge.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that the River Avon SSSI is in proximity, a Primary Aquifer underlies the site and there are some potentially contaminating land uses near the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and liaison with the Environment Agency.	N

Table 4.4 - Summary of Conclusions by Site [West]

W1 Hampton Business Park, Melksham	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the disconnection of the site from the wider rural landscape character and existing adjacent land uses the site has a high capacity to accommodate change. There are no landscape or visual receptors in the vicinity with a high sensitivity to change within the site. The main visual impacts could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive facility design and screen planting.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate, in	N

		transport terms, for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include a new formal access to be constructed between the existing access road and the site and consideration to linking the site to the adjacent Bowerhill Industrial Estate.	
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
W2 West Wiltshire Trading Estate, Westbury	Cultural Heritage	The extensively developed nature of the site indicates that there would not be any adverse effect on the setting of any Listed Buildings within the study area. The potential for the presence of currently unrecorded archaeological deposits within the site is low. No further archaeological assessment is recommended and no mitigation would be required. The setting of the Scheduled Monument will require consideration within design proposals.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the existing industrial character of this site and the nearby Northacre Trading Estate any change it not likely to alter the character dramatically. Potential views will need to be screened to preserve the character and feel of the surrounding area ensuring the open countryside surrounding the site is not affected.	N
	Noise	The site is on an existing industrial estate partially shielded by purpose made screening in the east with a residential estate to the south east. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences to achieve 5 - 10 dB(A) reduction is required, the location of which will depend on the sitting of the facility. The facilities should be sited away from the residential properties by at least 150m. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high without mitigation. Measures to control emissions of local air pollutants from combustion plant, and of dust, odour and bio-aerosols are recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures as set out in this report. In addition, consideration of the appropriate location of the site within the trading estate should be considered and HGV routing should be enforced through Hawkridge Road towards the north only	N

	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
W3 North Acre trading Estate, Westbury	Cultural Heritage	Based on current information it is recommended that further archaeological investigation is required to better understand the significance and extent (or location within the site) of potential buried archaeological remains. These could take the form of a programme of field surveys comprising geophysical survey followed by trial trenching. The results of these investigations could be used to inform a mitigation strategy. This strategy could involve the locating of ground disturbing works away from known areas of significant archaeological remains. The scope of any programme of archaeological investigations should be agreed in advance with the Wiltshire County Archaeologist. The study area includes two designated Scheduled Monuments, a moated site (W3-a) and the former Medieval settlement of Brook (W3-b). It is likely that future development within the site, especially in the south and west would affect the setting of the latter. Development in the south and west of the site could also potentially adversely affect the setting of Grade II Listed Brook farmhouse (W3-c). Sensitive design proposals and landscaping and screening options should be devised in consultation with English Heritage and Wiltshire Council's Conservation Officer in order to ensure appropriate mitigation.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	Given the size and diverse character of this site, it is not possible to make firm conclusions on the significance of the landscape and visual impact, however given that the site is allocated for Employment use and will ultimately be developed, the residual impact is likely to be slight. Given the urban fringe location of the site and proximity of some residential properties and footpaths however, it is essential that sensitive site planning and visual mitigation measures are incorporated.	N
	Noise	The site is on a partially complete industrial estate which is partially shielded by the railway and existing buildings. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required, the location of which will depend on the siting of the facility. The facilities should be sited at least 150m away from the residential properties. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high. Measures to control emissions of local air	N

	Odour	pollutants from combustion plant, and of dust, odour and bioaerosols recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken.	
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
W4 Lafarge Cement Works	Landscape and Visual Impact	Given the large scale of the site, much of it is relatively well concealed during the summer months at least, by the strong hedgerow boundaries within its immediate vicinity. The site would be most visible to recreational visitors to Westbury Hill to the south. Given its existing weak rural character, any changes to the site would have little impact, either in landscape or visual terms. Indeed with additional native woodland buffer planting, there may be the opportunity to enhance parts of the site in visual or landscape terms.	N
	Noise	The site is currently utilised as cement works and clay pit with housing on the north west perimeter. The site is partially shielded by the screening bunds and the southern half of the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the northern and eastern boundaries. The facilities should be sited as far away from the north eastern boundary as practical, with a minimum distance of 150m from any residential development. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are moderate to high. Measures to control emissions of local air pollutants from combustion plant, and of dust, odour and bio-aerosols are recommended. Detailed assessment should be undertaken.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses, however, consideration of the appropriate location of the site within the Cement Works site should be given.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination	N

		assessment.	
W5 Bowerhill Industrial Estate, Melksham	Noise	The site is an existing industrial estate with a significant residential area located adjacent to the site's eastern boundary. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required on the northern and eastern boundaries, depending on the facilities location. The facilities should be sited as far away from the eastern boundary as practical with any external activities a minimum of 150m from any residential development. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Mitigation for dust and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses, however, consideration of the appropriate location of the site within the industrial estate and the potential to link the site directly to the A350 should be given.	N
W6 Canal Road Industrial Estate, Trowbridge	Noise	The site is on an existing industrial estate with residential properties on its northern, eastern and southern boundaries. There is little or no screening from the proposed site to the neighbouring properties, but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required, the location of which will depend on the final sitting of the facility. The facilities should be towards the middle and mid west of the site area and any external activities a minimum of 150m from any residential development. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Mitigation for dust and odour is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	This site can be accommodated in traffic terms with minimal impact on the wider highway network with no requirement for mitigation measures (i.e. the transport infrastructure to accommodate HGVs already exists to an acceptable level). However, despite the fact that HGVs use the existing estate, the site is not ideally located for a waste facility, as consideration ought to be given to the impacts on the residential amenity of the areas through which the HGVs will pass.	N
W7 West Ashton Industrial	Cultural Heritage	There is one heritage asset recorded on the WSMR on the periphery of the site. No earthwork remains survive and there would be no impact on setting.	N

Estate, Trowbridge		Development of the site may impact on currently unrecorded remains associated with known and unknown sites of buried archaeological remains. A programme of archaeological field surveys could be undertaken to assess the nature, extent and significance of any surviving remains.	
	Landscape and Visual Impact	The site is currently greenfield forming part of the setting of Trowbridge. Whilst it is relatively well screened by hedgerows and intervening off-site woodland vegetation in the summer months, it is likely to be visible to a wider audience in the winter. The site contributes to the semi-enclosed, rural floodplain character of the area and this would be significantly affected if the site were to be developed. It is important to consider that the site is already allocated for Employment use however, in the West Wiltshire District Local Plan, and could therefore be developed in any event. If this was to occur, the residual landscape and visual effects would be minimal, either resulting in no change or slight adverse effects.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate, in transport terms, for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include a new site access off West Ashton Road into the site. Given that the recommended route to the site will be from the southeast, most vehicles accessing the site will be right turners. A right turn ghost island is therefore recommended at this new access.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
W8 Warminster Business Park, Warminster	Cultural Heritage	There is one potentially surviving heritage asset recorded on the WSMR on the eastern periphery of the site, recent development having removed other known assets. No earthwork remains survive and there would be no impact on setting. Development of the site may impact on currently unrecorded remains associated with known and unknown sites of buried archaeological remains. A programme of archaeological field surveys could be undertaken to assess the nature, extent and significance of any surviving remains.	N
	Noise	The site is an existing industrial estate with residential dwellings on the south, west and eastern boundary. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and careful site location the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required, the	N

		location of which will depend on the siting of the facility. The facilities should be sited towards the centre of the site with a minimum separation distance of 100m from Bath Road and 120m from the residential properties to the east. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	
	Air Quality and Odour	Air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. No mitigation is required at this site, although consideration should be made as to how to control potential parking issues which may occur, and to also provide a link road between the two parts of the site.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and is in a SPZ 2and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
W9 Chitterne Waste Management Facility	Cultural Heritage	Based on current information it is recommended that further archaeological investigation is required to better understand the significance and extent (or location within the site) of these possible remains. Further investigations could take the form of a programme of field surveys comprising geophysical survey followed by trial trenching. The results of these investigations could be used to inform a mitigation strategy. This strategy could involve the locating of ground disturbing works away from known areas of significant buried remains. The scope of any programme of archaeological investigations should be agreed in advance with the Wiltshire County Archaeologist. The study area includes one designated Scheduled Monument and several others are located close to the study area to the north, south-west and south-east. It is likely that any development within the site would affect the settings of these assets though topography suggests this would be contingent on the height and mass of any proposed development. This could be mitigated with appropriate screening and landscaping.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	This is a greenfield site in an open, rural location that is designated as a Special Landscape Area. Its use for waste treatment would therefore contribute to the erosion of the countryside. With strategically placed, substantial woodland buffers, the visual impact of the proposals could be reduced however. Due to its remote location, few visual receptors would be	N

		significantly affected, although until vegetative screens establish, users of the B390 would have glimpses of the site.	
	Noise	The site is an existing waste management facility. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. No mitigation measures are required. The site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	The site is located north of the B390 and approximately 1.5 kilometres east of Chitterne Village. There are no AQMAs, properties or ecological sites within 500 metres of the site. Consequently there will be negligible air quality impacts associated with this site.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures which include improvements are made to the site access, new signage to highlight the presence of the access, seasonal trimming of vegetation on the verge and potential the provision of a right turn ghost island, should capacity assessments indicate the junction is not suitable to accommodate the proposed traffic volumes.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that the site is underlain by a Primary Aquifer and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work to be required include a flood risk assessment and surface water control plan and contamination assessment.	N

Table 4.5 - Summary of Conclusions by Site [Swindon]

SW1 Chapel Farm, Blunsdon	Cultural Heritage	There are no heritage assets recorded within the site (although part of one asset recorded within study area could extend into the site). Four undesignated archaeological sites and three Grade II Listed Buildings are recorded within the study area. The possible archaeological feature recorded within the site should be subject to archaeological evaluation in advance of development. Further mitigation may be required depending on the outcome of the evaluation. The Listed Buildings within the study area would be screened from development by vegetation and tree cover. Providing the existing screening remains in place, they would not be adversely affected by development and no mitigation would be required.	N
	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the a relatively open wider landscape and rolling topography with a significant rise to the south of the site there is limited opportunity to develop the site in minor to minimise adverse impact on the local	N

		and surround character and visual receptors. However, due to the disturbed nature of the surrounding landscape and potential for vegetation screening for which the precedent has been set by the historic hedgerow patterns and recent roadwork's to the A419. Therefore the site has a medium to high ability to accommodate change. The main visual impacts, on surrounding residences and farms, could be almost entirely mitigated through sensitive site planning and screen planting.	
	Noise	The site is currently farm land with residential properties on the north east boundary. There is little or no screening from the proposed site but with appropriate screening and sitting of the facility the site is considered suitable with respect to noise for the proposed uses. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required and the facility should be sited towards the west of the site away from residential buildings with a minimum separation distance of 150m.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate without mitigation. Dust, bioaerosol and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment is recommended for bioaerosols and odour with account for local topography. Further assessment should be undertaken for PM10 and dust.	N
	Transport	The proposed site is considered appropriate, in transport terms, for the proposed uses with consideration of the mitigation measures as set out in this report.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water features within 1km of the site and there are potentially contaminating land uses in the area. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
SW2 Waterside Park, Swindon	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the existing condition and use of the site, the significance of impacts related to the development of the site for waste management purposes is likely to be slight. Given the urban fringe location of the site and proximity of some residential properties and footpaths however, it is essential that sensitive site planning and visual mitigation measures are incorporated.	N
	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial estate with properties at a distance to the north. No mitigation is expected to be required .The site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Due to the sites existing use and setting the risks associated with the potential uses are low. No requirement for further assessment.	N

	Transport	The proposed site provides an ideal location for a new waste facility given that the site currently operates as an existing HRC and is situated in an industrial area. The site provides good access and the traffic impact is unlikely to unduly affect capacity in the area, however capacity assessments would be required.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that the River Ray immediately adjacent to the site which is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and potentially contaminating industrial and waste activities at and near the site. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further work and assessment that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and a contamination assessment.	N
SW3 Brindley Close/ Derby Close, Swindon	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial estate and sited well away from residential dwellings and hence is suitable for the proposed uses with respect to noise. No mitigation is assumed to be necessary. The site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate (in-combination) without mitigation. Dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Further assessment should be undertaken for odour.	N
	Transport	The proposed site provides an ideal location for a new waste facility. As the site is situated in an industrial area planning issues related to transport should be minimal. Therefore, provided operational vehicles access the site via the south, rather than the north, the site will provide a suitable location for a waste facility.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	The initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity and the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required include a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity, the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site that could gives rise to potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a contamination assessment.	N
SW4	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial estate and sited well away from residential dwellings and hence	N

Land at Kendrick Industrial Estate, Swindon		is suitable for the proposed uses with respect to noise. No mitigation is expected to be necessary. The site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate (in-combination). Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) increases the risk to bioaerosols and odour; further assessment is recommended. As a minimum, basic dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	Access to the strategic freight network can be gained via the A3102; however, some issues regarding capacity would require further investigation. However, in general the site would provide a good location to provide waste facilities with consideration for mitigation measures including the resurfacing of Galton Way as well as providing better pedestrian facilities along the road.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity and the site is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. The further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and contamination assessment.	N
SW5 Transfer Bridges Industrial Estate, Swindon	Noise	The allocated site is currently used as a railway depot on an existing industrial estate, and is adjacent to a residential property. Even with careful siting and screening the site is considered too close to the residential properties with respect to noise.The site is not deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	Y
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate. As a minimum, basic dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. However, consideration of the mitigation measures is required to ensure the site access is fit for purpose. Recommended mitigation includes improvements to the mini roundabout on Ocotal Way, the level of which would be dependent on the nature of the development.	N
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site that could gives rise to a significant risk of potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a	N

		contamination assessment.	
SW6 Barnfield Sewerage Works	Noise	The site is located within land currently occupied by a sewerage works, with open land and industrial units on the boundaries. The site is part of an existing industrial estate and sited well away from residential dwellings and hence is suitable for the proposed uses with respect to noise. No mitigation is deemed to be necessary. The site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise	N
	Air Quality and Odour	All air quality risks for the intended use are high without mitigation. Bioaerosol and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary as the site is currently used for water treatment.	N
	Water Quality / Environment	This initial screening indicates that there is a surface water course adjacent to the site which is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site that could gives rise to a significant risk of potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site, the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required includes a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan, and contamination assessment.	N
SW7 Land within Dorcan Industrial Estate	Landscape and Visual Impact	Due to the existing condition of the site and surrounding character of the Dorcan Industrial Estate, the significance of impacts related to the development of the site for waste management purposes is likely to be slight to negligible, however care will need to be taken to ensure impacts on residents to the south are minimised. Landscape enhancements may provide a beneficial impact for the site and character of the Dorcan Industrial Estate as a whole.	N
	Noise	The site is part of an existing industrial estate with little or no screening to residential properties to the south west. Acoustic screening in the form of bunds, buildings or fences is required. The facility should be sited as far away from the dwellings to the south east boundary as practical and a buffer of 150m should be maintain although this may be reduced through acitivities being house in building and the careful siting of structures. With mitigation the site is deemed suitable for the intended uses with respect to noise.	N
	Air Quality and Odour	Residential receptors have been identified within 500 metres of the site. There are no ecologically sensitive sites within 500 metres of the site. Dust and odour control measures are recommended. All air quality risks for the intended use are low to moderate. As a minimum, basic dust and odour mitigation is recommended. Detailed assessment should not be necessary.	N
	Transport	The site is considered appropriate for the proposed uses. It is recommended that the western access be used as the main site access, and that the eastern	N

		access can be considered for use as an exit only for the site.	
	Contaminated Land	The initial screening indicates that there are surface water courses in proximity and there has been extensive past and present industrial use of site that could gives rise to a significant risk of potential contamination issues. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation within the design of the site the risks to the water environment from the proposed scheme options would be minimised. Further assessment and work that will be required include a contamination assessment.	N

This page has intentionally been left blank