



**Wiltshire & Swindon Aggregate Minerals Site
Allocations Local Plan**

Submission Stage

Sustainability Appraisal Report: Addendum

**(Incorporating Habitats Regulations
Assessment Update)**

July 2012

Centre for Sustainability (C4S) *in association with*
Enfusion



Report Number: CPR1360

Version: FINAL

Prepared by: Rob Gardner

Checked by: Clare Harmer

Client: Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council

Copyright: TRL Limited July 2012

This report has been prepared for Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council, is unpublished and should not be referred to in any other document or publication without the permission of Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Pre-Submission Consultation Representations	1
3	Minor Modifications to the Local Plan since Pre-Submission Publication (January 2012)	1
4	Implications of Minor Modifications for the SA	2
4.1	Methodology.....	2
4.2	Screening of Proposed Minor Modifications	2
4.3	Cumulative Effects	4
5	Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	4
6	Conclusion	5
	Appendix A.....	6

List of Tables

Table 1: General changes/comments on approach/comments on introduction	6
Table 2: Comments by site: Cox's Farm	12
Table 3: Comments by site: Blackburr Farm	17
Table 4: Comments by site: North Farm.....	20
Table 5: Comments by site: Land east of Calcutt.....	22
Table 6: Comments by site: Land at Cotswold Community	26
Table 7: Comments by site: Land near Compton Bassett.....	30
Table 8: Comments by site: Extensions to Brickworth Quarry	32

1 Introduction

Wiltshire and Swindon Borough Council's Proposed Aggregate Minerals Site Allocations Development Plan Document (now Local Plan following changes to the planning system following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework herein after referred to as the 'Plan'), was published for public consultation between 30th January 2012 and 12th March 2012.

It was accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report, both produced by consultants C4S at TRL Ltd, with support of their partners Enfusion. The Councils have proposed minor modifications to submit with the Plan, when it is 'Submitted' to the Secretary of State in July 2012.

The SA/SEA of the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Development Framework has been an iterative and ongoing process since 2005. In keeping with this, it is necessary to consider the changes that are proposed to be made to the Plan since the publication of the Pre-Submission DPD in January 2012.

This SA Report Addendum outlines these changes and considers how they affect the findings of the Pre-Submission SA Report (January 2012) and the HRA Screening Report (January 2012). This addendum report should be read in conjunction with those previous reports for a full account of how the Sustainability Appraisal and HRA have influenced the process to date.

2 Pre-Submission Consultation Representations

A series of representations were received during the consultation on the Pre-Submission Plan. Full details of the representations are provided in a statement prepared by Wiltshire Council that sets out all the consultation stages and outcomes throughout the plan preparation. This statement has been prepared to meet the requirements of regulation 22(1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012.

None of the representations related specifically to the SA Report, however some concern was expressed that cumulative effects (associated with proposed minerals development) had not been adequately addressed for all sites.

As the SA Report (Section 5.2) had considered the potential for cumulative effects to arise from the implementation of the Plan, further discussion on cumulative effects is provided in Section 4.3 of this Addendum.

3 Minor Modifications to the Local Plan since Pre-Submission Publication (January 2012)

Following an assessment of the comments received through the pre-submission consultation process, a number of minor modifications to the Plan have been proposed. These proposed minor modifications will be considered at the independent examination of the Plan.

The proposed minor modifications are detailed in Appendix A.

4 Implications of Minor Modifications for the SA

The aim of this post-consultation stage of the SA/SEA process was to determine whether there were likely to be any significant sustainability effects arising from the proposed minor modifications to the Aggregate Minerals Site Allocations Local Plan.

In order to do this it was necessary to identify whether any of the proposed minor modifications to the plan could result in changes to the original findings of the SA, as documented in the SA Report (January 2012), either through new significant sustainability effects being identified, or through originally identified significant effects no longer being considered likely.

4.1 Methodology

Given that the majority of the proposed modifications were anticipated to be minor in nature, it would not have been proportionate to undertake a full assessment of all of the changes against the SA Framework. Therefore, a screening process was undertaken which considered the nature of each of the proposed modifications and determined whether it would be likely to result in a significant sustainability effect that would require an additional stage of sustainability appraisal to be undertaken.

The screening used three levels of categorisation for the potential implications of each of the proposed modifications on the original sustainability appraisal as follows:

- No update to SA required;
- Implications (either positive or negative) for SA objectives but no update to SA findings required; or
- Modification requires an additional assessment.

4.2 Screening of Proposed Minor Modifications

The findings of the screening process are detailed in the tables in Appendix A.

None of the proposed minor modifications (PMs), or combinations of modifications, were considered as being likely to result in significant effects on sustainability – or changes to previously identified significant effects. However some modifications were identified as being likely to help progress certain SA objectives. These are summarised as follows:

All Sites

- The additional requirements in PM6 relating to Dust Management Plans and air quality assessments will have positive implications for SA Objectives 2 (Health and Wellbeing) and SA11 (Minimise Pollution);
- The additional requirements in PM7 relating to noise and vibration assessments and locating any unavoidable noise or vibration generating activities away from sensitive receptors will have positive implications for SA Objectives 2 (Health and Wellbeing) and SA11 (Minimise Pollution);
- Additional emphasis on limiting the impacts of HGV movements (PM8) will help progress SA Objective 4 (SA4) (Sustainable transportation/Reduce the impacts of transport); and
- Additional requirement for the provision of proposals to protect the floodplain where necessary (PM9) will have positive implications for SA Objectives 9 (Water) and 13 (Climate Change Adaptation).

Cox's Farm

- The additional requirement in PM11 for sites to be restored in a phased manner will have positive implications for SA Objectives 2 (Health and Wellbeing), 6 (Wise use of Land) and 7 (Landscape);
- Greater consideration of the public rights of way network during site restoration (PM12) will help to progress SA2 (Health and Wellbeing);
- Developing a 'Zone of Sensitivity' (PM13, PM14 and PM16) will have positive implications for SA2 (Health and Wellbeing), SA7 (Landscape), SA8 (Cultural Heritage) and SA11 (Minimise Pollution); and
- Strengthening the wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response will help to progress SA8 (Cultural Heritage).

Blackburr Farm

- Highlighting the importance of the Cotswold Canal project (PM19) has positive implications for SA2 (Health and Wellbeing); and
- Strengthening the wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response (PM20) will help to progress SA8 (Cultural Heritage).

North Farm

- Strengthening the wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response (PM23) will help to progress SA8 (Cultural Heritage).

Land east of Calcutt

- Strengthening wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response (PM27) will help to progress SA8 (Cultural Heritage).

Land at Cotswold Community

- Strengthening the wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response (PM31) will help to progress SA8 (Cultural Heritage); and
- Additional text relating to the consideration of listed buildings within the site boundary (PM33) has been identified as having positive implications for SA8 (Cultural Heritage).

Land near Compton Bassett

No implications for the sustainability appraisal other than those identified relating to transport impacts and the water environment as identified for "All Sites" above.

Extensions to Brickworth Quarry

- Strengthening the wording in this section to state the need for management of the site post restoration principally for biodiversity (PM37) will help progress SA5 (Biodiversity);
- The addition of text relating to exploring options to link woodland habitats in the area (PM38) will also have positive implications for SA5; and
- Additional text that requires consideration of impacts on the setting of the New Forest National Park (PM40) will help progress SA7 (Landscape).

4.3 Cumulative Effects

The SA Report (January 2012) identified the potential for cumulative effects to arise from implementing the Plan against a range of SA/SEA topics. Mitigation measures were identified that would help to reduce the potential for adverse effects. Some of these measures related to existing policies in operation in Wiltshire and Swindon (e.g. Minerals Development Control DPD policies), whilst other measures were made as recommendations in the SA Report.

The proposed minor modifications to the Plan (as detailed in Appendix A) will help to further support the mitigation of adverse cumulative effects. In particular relating to the following topics:

Human Health and Amenity

The greater emphasis given to the consideration of air quality (dust) and noise & vibration issues, in light of the recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), will have positive implications for areas that are in proximity to extraction sites.

Expanding the requirements for transport assessments so that they have to consider the environmental impacts of proposals on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes will help to reduce impacts on all those affected by mineral operations, not just those living in close proximity. This will help to address one of the main concerns raised during the consultation process.

Traffic and Transportation

In relation to the potential for cumulative effects associated with minerals transport in the Upper Thames Valley, these will be further mitigated by the introduction of a new requirement to ensure that all relevant strategic and local considerations (including HGV movements along the A419 and the requirements of other plans and strategies in the area) have been factored into the development of minerals proposals.

Cultural Heritage

Strengthening the Plan's wording in relation to the requirement for appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008), will help in reducing the potential for adverse cumulative effects on heritage assets.

Water

The additional requirement for the provision of proposals to protect the floodplain where necessary will have positive implications for the water environment in areas around the extraction sites.

5 Habitats Regulations Assessment

Each of the proposed minor modifications has been considered in relation to its potential to alter the findings of the HRA screening process that was undertaken during the development of the Local Plan, as reported in the HRA Screening Report (January 2012). The results of this additional round of screening are detailed in the tables included in Appendix A.

None of the proposed minor modifications were identified as having any implications for the original conclusions of the HRA, i.e. that extraction of aggregate minerals at the sites included in the Local Plan will not have likely

significant effects on the European sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

6 Conclusion

None of the proposed minor modifications to the Local Plan significantly alter the findings of the SA Report. However there are a range of proposed minor modifications, as identified in Section 4 that will help advance progress towards achieving several of the SA Objectives. No proposed minor modifications were identified which if implemented would result in a movement away from achieving one or more SA objectives.

In addition there are no implications for the original conclusions of the HRA screening process.

Appendix A

Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications arising from the consultation on the Proposed Submission draft Aggregate Minerals Site Allocations Local Plan Consultation

Table 1: General changes/comments on approach/comments on introduction

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes / No) / agreed	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
PM1	Update copyright dates for all maps in the plan.	Yes	Figure 1.1, Area and Inset Maps.	<u>Maps and Figures</u> Copyright details for all maps and figures to be updated to read " <u>© Crown copyright and database rights 2012 Ordnance Survey 100049050</u> "	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
PM2	Amend figure 1.1 to un-embolden the boundary of Southampton.	Yes	Figure 1.1	<u>Figure 1.1</u> To be amended to remove bold outline of Southampton area in the interests of consistency.	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
PM3	In accordance with the National Planning Policy requirements for Development Frameworks to be called Development Plans and Development Plan	Yes	All relevant references	<u>All relevant references</u> Replace all references to Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) with ' <u>Development Plans</u> ' and all references to Development Plan Documents/DPD to ' <u>Local Plan(s)</u> '.	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

	Documents to be re-termed Local Plans - update all references.					
PM4	Replace all references to the draft National Planning Policy Framework with National Planning Policy Framework	Yes	All relevant references	All relevant references Replace all references to the draft National Planning Policy Framework with ' <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i> '	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
PM5	In accordance with the National Planning Policy delete references to MPS's and PPS's/PPG's and/or replace with NPPF where relevant.	Yes	All relevant references	All relevant references Delete references to MPS's and PPS's/PPG's and/or replace with ' <i>NPPF</i> ' where relevant.	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
	Comments in order of Local Plan site profile					
	Human Health and Amenity					
PM6	Through ongoing discussion with the Public Protection Service a change to the wording is proposed.	Yes	The Air Quality section within the Human Health and Amenity criteria within each of the site profile tables.	Through discussions with Public Protection Services regarding the position to take in light of the recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and following their advice on other issues concerning arbitrary separation distances a change to the wording of the Human Health and Amenity – Air Quality sections of all sites is proposed. 'A <i>robust Dust Management Plan (DMP)</i> will need to be provided to support any subsequent planning application process. Where appropriate, reasonable and practicable,	Positive implications for SA Objectives 2 and 11, but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

			<p>dust-generating activities should be located away from dust sensitive receptors. The DMP should identify and provide appropriate mitigation and monitoring proposals for dust-generating activities. Where appropriate, reasonable and practicable, a minimum 100 metre 'stand-off distance' to dust sensitive receptors should be planned for within the overall design of the site.. <u>This DMP must demonstrate that dust emissions are identified and that any potential health or nuisance impacts are eliminated or mitigated so far as is possible. The DMP shall, as a minimum, contain information and assessment as outlined in Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and take into account any changes in national guidance, European guidance and scientific or technical knowledge that exist at the time the application and assessment is undertaken. Where appropriate, reasonable and practicable any dust generating activities should be located away from dust sensitive receptors.</u></p> <p><u>An air quality assessment shall be provided to support any subsequent planning application process. This should, as a minimum, incorporate an assessment of nitrogen dioxide and particulate emissions from the</u></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p><u>operation of the site and associated on and off site vehicle movements. The assessment must identify so far as is possible any possible health or environmental impacts and demonstrate how these may be eliminated or mitigated.</u></p> <p>Please note that through discussions with residents of Cox's Farm a 'Zone of Sensitivity' with minimum 100m buffer zone has been negotiated and this is reflected in PM13 – Human Health and Amenity section of Table 2.2.</p>		
PM7	All sites should be assessed against the MPS2 minimum standard of noise control.		The Noise section within the Human Health and Amenity criteria within each of the site profile tables.	<p>Through discussions with Public Protection Services regarding the position to take in light of the recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and following their advice on other issues concerning arbitrary separation distances a change to the wording of the Human Health and Amenity – Noise sections of all sites is proposed. <i>'Detailed consideration will need to be applied to the design of the site at the planning application stage. Robust mitigation and site monitoring measures will need to be designed to reduce the impact of quarrying on surrounding properties and businesses. <u>A scheme of noise and vibration assessment and control must be provided to inform the design of the site at the planning application stage. The scheme must</u></i></p>	Positive implications for SA Objectives 2 and 11, but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

			<p><u>identify any potential noise or vibration impacts and demonstrate how, so far as is possible, these impacts will be eliminated, mitigated or controlled. A scheme shall, as a minimum, contain information and assessment as outlined in Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and take into account any changes in national guidance, European guidance and scientific or technical knowledge that exist at the time the application and assessment is undertaken.</u></p> <p>In addition, re-word the second bullet point to read:</p> <p><u>Utilising appropriately designed acoustic screening and baffle mounds and where appropriate, reasonable and practicable locating any unavoidable noise or vibration generating activities away from sensitive receptors.</u></p> <p>Please note that through discussions with residents of Cox's Farm a 'Zone of Sensitivity' with minimum 100m buffer zone has been negotiated and this is reflected in PM13 – Human Health and Amenity section of Table 2.2.</p>		
	Traffic and transportation				

PM8	The traffic and transportation section needs to be looked at in a co-ordinated way with other plans and strategies to limit the impacts of HGV movements on the A419 through Latton and Cricklade.	Yes	The Upper Thames Valley – context section.	<p><u>Context Section</u></p> <p>Reflect the fact that issues of a strategic and local nature will need to be addressed through the development of minerals proposals in the Upper Thames Valley. Additional text as a new paragraph to be added beneath paragraph 2.4, to read:</p> <p><u>'The planned release of minerals sites in the Upper Thames Valley will need to ensure that all relevant strategic and local considerations (including HGV movements along the A419 and the requirements of other plans and strategies in the area) have been factored into the development of minerals proposals.'</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	The Water Environment					
PM9	Reference should be made in all cases to the relevant Catchment Flood Management Plan and to Wiltshire Council's Flood Risk Assessment.	Yes in part	Water environment section of all site profile tables.	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Reference should be made to the Wiltshire SFRA and to floodplain protection. However it was felt unnecessary to make reference to relevant catchment flood management plans. Suggested change in all water environment sections to read <u>'With reference to the Wiltshire SFRA, the site is....A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any subsequent planning application with proposals to protect the floodplain where necessary.'</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objectives 9 and 13, but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
PM10	Add text to detail the relevant vulnerability of	Yes	Water environment	Through discussion with the Environment Agency and following the Agency's advice.	No update to	No update to

	aquifers for each site.		section of all site profile tables.	Add text into the water environment section of all site profile tables detailing the vulnerability of aquifers in relation to each site.	SA required	HRA required
--	-------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--	-------------	--------------

Table 2: Comments by site: Cox's Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested / agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Preferred restoration objective					
PM11	Through ongoing discussions with residents of Marston Meysey, to mitigate the local environmental impact of quarrying/birdstrike risk, it is proposed that wording be added to emphasise that restoration should be undertaken in a phased manner alongside working.	Yes	Table 2.2 – Preferred restoration objective	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Therefore it is proposed to add the following wording: '<i><u>The site must be sensitively designed and, worked and restored in a phased manner to reduce the local environmental impact of quarrying.</u></i>'</p>	Positive implications for SA Objectives 2, 6 and 7, but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

PM12	The restoration sub-section fails to give adequate prominence to the public rights of way network and its importance to landscape setting locally. The restoration section should be amended to ensure any subsequent restoration scheme preserves, enhances, maintains and improves these features. Through ongoing discussions with residents of Marston Meysey regarding the incorporation of a 'Zone of Sensitivity' it has been proposed that this is referenced in the preferred restoration objective for the site.	Yes	Table 2.2 – Preferred restoration objective	It is agreed that reference should be made to the need to retain and enhance the existing PRow network on the site and that the 'Zone of Sensitivity' be integrated into the wider restoration scheme and PRow network. Text should be altered to read <i><u>'In addition, there should be no net loss or degradation of the important local-footpath PRow network in the area, these features should, where possible, be maintained during working and enhanced during restoration. The 'Zone of Sensitivity' should also be integrated into the wider restoration scheme and PRow network.'</u></i>	Positive implications for SA Objective 2 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	Human Health and Amenity					
PM13	A 'Zone of Sensitivity' should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the	Yes – in part	Table 2.2 – Human Health and Amenity	<u>Site Profiles</u> It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. Through ongoing negotiations with residents of Marston Meysey, an indicative 'Zone of Sensitivity' to be incorporated on to Inset Map 1: Cox's Farm has been agreed in	Positive implications for SA Objectives 2, 7, 8 and 11 but no update to SA findings	No update to HRA required

	residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area. Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site map.			principle and will need to be discussed further at examination. The following text should be added to the bottom of the human health and amenity section: <u>'To protect the historic character and residential amenity of Marston Meysey, a 'Zone of Sensitivity' incorporating a proposed minimum 100m 'stand off distance' and precise details concerning the boundaries of the Zone, the treatment of those boundaries, the phasing of works within the site and other amelioration measures during the operations will need to be negotiated and agreed at the planning application stage.'</u>	required.	
	Landscape and visual					
PM14	A 'Zone of Sensitivity' should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area. Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site	Yes – in part	Table 2.2 – Landscape and Visual	Site Profiles It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. Through ongoing negotiations with residents of Marston Meysey, an indicative 'Zone of Sensitivity' to be incorporated on to Inset Map 1: Cox's Farm has been agreed in principle and will need to be discussed further at examination. The following text should be added to the landscape and visual section: <u>'...to protect the historic landscape setting of Marston Meysey village. A 'Zone of Sensitivity' incorporating a proposed minimum</u>	Positive implications for SA Objectives 2, 7, 8 and 11 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

	map.			<u>100m 'stand off distance' and precise details concerning the boundaries of the Zone, the treatment of those boundaries, the phasing of works within the site and other amelioration measures during the operations will need to be negotiated and agreed at the planning application stage.'</u>		
	Archaeology					
PM15	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.	Yes	Table 2.2 – Archaeology	<p>Site Profiles</p> <p>Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:</p> <p><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	Historic built environment					
PM16	A 'Zone of Sensitivity'	Yes - in part	Table 2.2 –	Site Profiles	Positive	No update to

	<p>should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area.</p> <p>Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site map.</p>		Historic built environment	<p>It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. Through ongoing negotiations with residents of Marston Meysey, an indicative 'Zone of Sensitivity' to be incorporated on to Inset Map 1: Cox's Farm has been agreed in principle and will need to be discussed further at examination. The following text should be added to the Historic built environment section: <i><u>'Mitigation will need to offer robust buffer and landscape screening to the west of the site in order to protect the setting of the Marston Meysey Conservation Area.'</u></i> <i><u>A 'Zone of Sensitivity' incorporating a proposed minimum 100m 'stand off distance' and precise details concerning the boundaries of the Zone, the treatment of those boundaries, the phasing of works within the site and other amelioration measures during the operations will need to be negotiated and agreed at the planning application stage.'</u></i></p>	<p>implications for SA Objectives 2, 7, 8 and 11 but no update to SA findings required.</p>	HRA required
	Traffic and transportation					
PM17	<p>Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties</p>	Yes – In part	Table 2.2 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on</p>	<p>Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update</p>	No update to HRA required

	adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.			the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any subsequent planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>‘A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</u>	to SA findings required.	
--	---	--	--	---	--------------------------	--

Table 3: Comments by site: Blackburr Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Site Description					
PM18	Include reference to the PRoW running centrally	Yes – in part	Table 2.3 - Site	Site Profiles Agreed. Incorporate reference to the	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

	through the small parcel of land to the west and for the need to retain access for infrastructure providers.		description	PRoW on the site. The retention of infrastructure provider access will need to be addressed as part of a planning application process. Insert text to read ' <i>...where vegetation does not offer natural screening. A PRoW runs through the southern section of the site.</i> '		
	Preferred restoration objective					
PM19	Amend wording to highlight the importance of the canal project in the area. Wording to state that 'restoration of the canal at this location must be considered within the wider context of the restoration of the Cotswold Canals project as a whole.'	Yes – in part	Table 2.3 – Preferred restoration objective	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed in part. Whilst the preferred restoration objective section of the table could more strongly refer to the need for the restoration of the canal network at this location, to suggest that it 'must' would be to pre-determine any restoration scheme proposed through a planning application. Therefore suggested amended wording to read '<i>Restoration of the canal which bisects the site could also be considered as part of a wider restoration project should be considered within the wider context of the Cotswold Canals restoration project as a whole.</i> However,...</p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 2 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	Archaeology					
PM20	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate	Yes	Table 2.3 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent</p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8	No update to HRA required

	investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.			replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section: <u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u>	but no update to SA findings required.	
	Traffic and transportation					
PM21	Strengthen the text in this section to refer to the requirement for improvements to the C124.	Yes	Table 2.3 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> This change can be accommodated by utilising the same detail as that used for the Cox's Farm traffic and transportation section as both sites could access the C124. Suggested wording to incorporate <u>'The site should be treated as an extension to nearby sites, utilising existing access arrangements wherever possible. Access from the site could make use of the C124 although appropriately planned improvements will need to be made to this route to ensure that it is of an appropriate</u>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

				<u>standard for accommodating minerals HGVs.</u>		
PM22	Make reference to the fact that – ‘Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.	Yes – In part	Table 2.3 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>‘A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

Table 4: Comments by site: North Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested / agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations

						Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Archaeology					
PM23	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.	Yes	Table 2.4 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:</p> <p><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	Traffic and transportation					
PM24	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties	Yes – In part	Table 2.4 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this</p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update	No update to HRA required

	adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.			will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>‘A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</u>	to SA findings required.	
--	---	--	--	---	--------------------------	--

Table 5: Comments by site: Land east of Calcutt

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Site Description					
PM25	Amend the section to mention that public Water Mains and Sewers may lie	Yes	Table 2.5 - Site description	<u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, this information should be incorporated into the site description.	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

	across the site.			<u>Suggested addition to text '<i>The site is crossed by an oil pipeline, and low level power lines and possible water mains and sewer. Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to establish the location of installations, and to arrange for them to be diverted and/or safeguarded where necessary should be made.</i></u>		
PM26	Early consultation to establish the position of such mains, and to arrange for them to be diverted where necessary should be made to the relevant water/sewerage company.	Yes	Table 2.5 – Any other issues row	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>To introduce the requirement for consideration regarding the infrastructure running across the site, add an additional row titled 'Any other issues' above the 'Cumulative effects' row with the following text: '<u>Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to establish the location of installations on site, and to arrange for them to be diverted and/or safeguarded where necessary, should be made as part of any planning application process.</u>'</p>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
	Archaeology					
PM27	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals	Yes	Table 2.5 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the</p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

	Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.			Archaeology section: <u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u>		
	Traffic and transportation					
PM28	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 2.5 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual</u>	Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

				<u>properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</u>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Table 6: Comments by site: Land at Cotswold Community

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Site Description					
PM29	Make specific reference to the sewage works located on the site.	Yes	Table 2.6 - Site description	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, this information should be incorporated into the site description. Suggested addition to text '<i>The spine road cycle track also runs along the southern perimeter of the site. A sewage works facility is located within the southern section of the site.</i>'</p>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
PM30	Wording will need to be introduced to highlight the need for early consultation with the relevant infrastructure company to arrange for the sewage works facility and any associated infrastructure to be safeguarded and/or diverted where necessary.	Yes	Table 2.6 – Any other issues row	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>To introduce the requirement for consideration regarding the infrastructure running across the site, add an additional row titled 'Any other issues' above the 'Cumulative effects' row with the following text: '<u>Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to arrange for the sewage works facility and any associated</u></p>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

				<u>infrastructure (once location is established) to be safeguarded and/or diverted where necessary should be made as part of any planning application process.'</u>		
	Archaeology					
PM31	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.	Yes	Table 2.6 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:</p> <p><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></p>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
PM32	Add 'English Heritage' as a contact that any prospective applicant will need to work closely with when bringing forward proposals.	Yes	Table 2.6 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>Agreed, due to the potential for archaeology findings on and around the site associated with the historically important features in the area this change should be accommodated into the archaeology section of the site profile. Text addition to read '<i>...any applicant will</i></p>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required

				<i>need to work closely with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage to develop and implement sufficient and suitable mitigation plans.'</i>		
	Historic built environment					
PM33	Due to the presence of listed buildings within the site boundary. Insert text to the effect of: 'A cultural heritage assessment and conservation plan to inform which buildings might be removed and the measures required to secure the enhancement of the historic farmstead should form part of any mitigation/restoration plan.'	Yes	Table 2.6 – Historic built environment	<u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, due to the listed status of some of the buildings located towards the centre of the site, information should be included within the plan requesting measures be put in place during operations to limit the impact on these buildings and to incorporate the buildings into any restoration proposals. Additional text should be inserted after the current text in this section and to read ' <u>A cultural heritage assessment and conservation plan to inform which buildings might be removed and the measures required to secure the enhancement of the historic farmstead should form part of any mitigation/restoration plan.'</u> <i>(proposed to cross reference this point in the restoration section of the site profile)</i>	Positive implications for SA Objective 8 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
	Traffic and transportation					
PM34	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned	Yes – In part	Table 2.6 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It	Positive implications for SA	No update to HRA required

	<p>to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.</p>			<p>is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u><i>‘These highlighted concerns will need to be addressed through a Transport Assessment submitted with a planning application and to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</i></u></p>	<p>Objective 4 but no update to SA findings required.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	---	--

Table 7: Comments by site: Land near Compton Bassett

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested / agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Site Description					
PM35	Planning consent for the 350 homes detailed has now been granted. Re-word the text to reflect this development and remove 'on appeal' text.	Yes	Table 3.2 – Site description	<u>Site Profiles</u> This change should be accommodated as an update to the current picture in the area. Altered text to read: <u>'Outline Planning consent for 350 homes at Sandpit Lane...has been granted on appeal.'</u>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
	Traffic and transportation					
PM36	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 3.2 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> Whilst this was not a change requested specifically for this site, in light of other comments and concerns about HGV movements in the area and impacts on Calne and surrounding villages along access routes, the councils are of the view that this change could be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of	Positive implications for SA Objective 4 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

				<p>vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with any planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</u></p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Table 8: Comments by site: Extensions to Brickworth Quarry

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested / agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document	Screening for additional Sustainability Appraisal	Screening for additional Habitats Regulations Assessment
	General comment/modifications					
	Preferred restoration objective					
PM37	Strengthen the wording in this section to state the need for management of the site post restoration principally for biodiversity.	Yes	Table 4.2 – Preferred restoration objective	Site Profiles This change should be accommodated, additional text to read: ' <u>Restoration must aim to deliver targets within the Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan (WBAP) to support BAP habitats and species and the site will need to be managed for biodiversity enhancement post restoration.</u> '	Positive implications for SA Objective 5 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required
PM38	Further wording in this section could state the need for reviewing opportunities across the remainder of the wider minerals site which already has planning permission, and exploring options to link woodland habitats in the area.	Yes	Table 4.2 – Preferred restoration objective	Site Profiles This change should be accommodated, additional text to read: ' <u>A key focus of the restored site must be the connectivity of habitats both within and around the site, seeking opportunities to link restored areas of the neighbouring mineral working consents. Options should be explored to link woodland habitats in the surrounding vicinity</u> '	Positive implications for SA Objective 5 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

				<i>and also out into the wider countryside area.'</i>		
	Biodiversity and geodiversity					
PM39	Review the detailed ecological site assessment outcomes to determine whether impacts to the New Forest SSSI (hydrologically) have been assessed and make reference to outcomes (i.e. whether the site will impact on this feature).	Yes	Table 4.2 – Biodiversity and geodiversity	<u>Site Profiles</u> This issue is referenced in the water environment section of the site profile. Through discussion with the County Ecologist, it has been confirmed that the detailed ecological site assessment does assess potential hydrological impacts to the New Forest SSSI. An addition to the text in this section of the plan can be made to make reference to the need for any planning applicant to provide evidence that the minerals workings will not impact on the water levels in adjacent areas such as the New Forest SSSI. Suggested text to read: <i>'As the <u>County Wildlife Sites and New Forest SSSI</u> are dependent on both surface water and ground water levels to maintain their special interest...'</i>	No update to SA required	No update to HRA required
	Landscape and visual					
PM40	As an outcome of the recent Waste Site Allocations DPD examination, it was suggested by the appointed Inspector that any proposals on site, be it	Yes	Table 4.2 – Landscape and visual	For consistency and conformity with the approach taken for the site as detailed through the Waste Site Allocations DPD, a requirement to strengthen the wording of the site profile by addressing the issue of proximity to the New Forest National Park is proposed. The following text	Positive implications for SA Objective 7 but no update to SA findings required.	No update to HRA required

<p>waste management operations or mineral working, will need to demonstrate that the interests of the New Forest National Park and its setting are not eroded. The suggested change to the landscape, townscape and visual section of the Waste Site Allocations DPD should therefore be replicated in this section of the Minerals Site Allocations DPD.</p>			<p>should be incorporated at the start of the landscape and visual section of the site profile: <u>'The proximity of the New Forest National Park will need to be fully considered through any subsequent planning application process. Proposals for further mineral working will need to demonstrate that the interests of the New Forest National Park and its setting are not eroded.'</u></p>		
---	--	--	---	--	--