

Wiltshire Council

Strategic Planning Committee

30 July 2014

Army Basing Programme - Master Plan

This report contains the following sections and appendices:

1. Report summary
2. Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy & Army Basing Programme master planning process
3. Background to the ABP Master Plan
4. Master Plan – summary of proposals
5. Master Plan – more detailed proposals
6. Overarching Environmental Assessment
7. Planning policy context
8. Stakeholder and community engagement
9. Planning issues
10. Infrastructure delivery and cumulative impacts
11. Conclusion
12. Legal Implications

RECOMMENDATION

Appendix 1: ABP Master Plan

Appendix 2: SCI summary list of third party consultation responses

Appendix 3: DIO response to comments by EA, NE & WC Ecologist

Appendix 4: Summary of responses from statutory consultees & other stakeholders

Appendix 5: Abbreviations

Important background reports to the Army Basing Programme Master Plan referred to in this report can be viewed in electronic form at the following address:

<https://n3g.4projects.com/document/publicfiles.aspx?DocumentID=d19c261e-a6d5-49a3-b7cd-361500565908#>

1. Report summary

- 1.1 The report summarises the content of the Army Basing Programme (ABP) Master Plan, as prepared by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). It sets out how the Master Plan has been prepared having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, as well as how consultations have been carried out with stakeholders and other interested parties and the responses received taken into account.
- 1.2 The report recommends that the Strategic Planning Committee notes and endorses the Master Plan as a critical background document which will inform the assessment of future planning applications to deliver the ABP. The Master Plan informs each application by defining the wider context and assessing the cumulative impacts, and so demonstrating in the broadest terms how and where development can, and cannot, take place. Critically, endorsement of the Master Plan would not be tantamount to the granting of any form of planning permission and nor would it fetter the Council's consideration of future ABP planning applications. The Master Plan would, however, provide the Council with a 'baseline' against which the future ABP applications would be judged, this particularly with regard to the opportunities and the constraints the Plan defines.
- 1.3 The Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA) is the largest military training area in the UK and consists of around 390 square km of land owned by the MOD. The Plain is a protected habitat of international value and an important historic landscape with many designated heritage assets including parts of the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site (WHS). The area in and around the plain hosts a number of established garrisons – these include Warminster, Bulford, Tidworth, Perham Down, Upavon and Larkhill.

2. Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy and the ABP master planning process

- 2.1 Core Policy 37 (CP37) of the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (eWCS) recognises that the military presence in Wiltshire has brought many benefits, particularly to the environment and the economy. In the light of the ongoing rationalisation of operational military facilities and establishments the eWCS acknowledges the need to plan for important changes to existing facilities and address the challenge of finding appropriate re-use for redundant facilities.
- 2.2 Specifically, CP37 acknowledges that the provision of new housing on MOD land for military personnel and other operational facilities will be required as a result of the ABP across the SPTA. It envisages that a single master plan should be developed, thereby front loading consultation and partnership working with the local community and other stakeholders. The master planning process could ensure that the infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development are established and can be delivered as well as enabling the cumulative impact of development arising from the programme to be addressed.

- 2.3 Wiltshire Council has worked in partnership with the DIO in preparing the ABP Master Plan which has resulted in enhanced public engagement and consultation as well as Joint Officer and Councillor working and steering groups which have informed the Plan.
- 2.4 It is clear that the preparation of the ABP Master Plan is integral to the ABP development process. DIO envisages that planning applications for the ABP will be submitted in a phased way. The Master Plan provides the context for these individual planning applications and shows how the options to accommodate development have been considered.
- 2.5 The detailed planning policy context and stakeholder/community engagement process and outcomes is considered at sections 7 and 8 respectively to this report.

3. Background to the ABP Master Plan

- 3.1 The Executive Summary to the Master Plan sets out the background to the ABP as follows:

“In March 2013, the Secretary of State for Defence announced the Regular Army Basing Plan. This set out the future lay down of Army units in the UK as units move back from Germany and restructure to deliver the Army 2020 future operating Model The Government has committed £1.644 billion to the new basing plan nationally, of which over £800 million will be spent on new accommodation. The Army Basing Plan has transitioned into a delivery as Army Basing Programme (ABP).

This includes better optimisation of the UK estate including greater concentration of the Army on Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA), where three high readiness Reaction Force Brigades will be based. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) has been liaising closely with Wiltshire Council since mid 2012 on preparing and planning for this increase in unit numbers and for the associated unit moves, programmed for implementation in the period 2015 to 2019.

..... [The Master Plan] brings together the key conclusions of the Assessment Studies for each Garrison and the Training Estate; the Planning Context Report; the Overarching Environmental Appraisal (OEA); and, the Outline Transport Assessment (OTA). It identifies the additional infrastructure requirements that are needed to support these moves and the associated planning applications that will be required to be submitted over the next few years. DIO has sought to engage relevant stakeholders at every phase of Masterplan preparation through a large number of meetings, formal and informal presentations, and a series of public consultation events designed to capture comments on ABP proposals for Salisbury Plain. Feedback received from stakeholders has helped to shape the proposals contained in the Masterplan”.

- 3.2 As is evident, the Master Plan brings together the key conclusions of a number of separate studies that combine to form the planning, assessment and initial design

process for the ABP. DIO has prepared a wide range of supporting studies to inform the selection of development sites and the constraints which will need to be addressed.

- 3.3 Assessment Studies have been undertaken of the Larkhill, Bulford, Tidworth, Perham Down and Upavon bases to identify the location and type of new buildings and the facilities that are needed to accommodate the increase of service personnel. A separate Assessment Study has also been undertaken on the Training Estate, which surrounds the bases, identifying the location and type of new training facilities that are needed. In parallel to the proposals for 'inside the wire' a Planning Context Report (PCR) has been prepared in a number of distinct phases to address the planned changes 'outside the wire', related to new Service Family Accommodation (SFA) and achieving 'balanced' communities.
- 3.4 Given the sensitivity and protection afforded to the Salisbury Plain landscape, an environmental sub-group (including all the statutory consultees) met regularly throughout the masterplan process to provide input to the site selection process and inform consideration of alternative options. An Overarching Environmental Appraisal (OEA) has also been prepared covering proposals for the bases, training estate and the SFA sites, which provides a broad evaluation of the environmental effects of the entire programme of works required by the Master Plan. The OEA reviews the following topics: ecology and nature conservation; cultural heritage; soil, groundwater and surface water; landscape and visual; ground conditions; noise and vibration; air quality; socioeconomics and community effects; and, transport and access. The output from the OEA will both ensure that any significant environmental effects have been identified at an early stage in order that they can be taken into account during the subsequent detailed design and planning stages.
- 3.5 The impact on the transport network of all the planned changes has been reviewed in an Outline Transport Assessment (OTA), which identifies the strategic transport mitigation proposals.

4. Master Plan – summary of proposals

- 4.1 The purpose of the Master Plan is to establish the constraints and opportunities for new development, and to provide an overview of where development will take place to support ABP. A copy of the complete Master Plan is attached to this report at **Appendix 1**.
- 4.2 At a strategic level the proposals will bring approximately 4,300 military personnel and their dependents, relocated to the Tidworth, Ludgershall (Perham Down), Bulford and Larkhill areas, in a phased programme between 2014 and 2019. The uplift in personnel at each base, which is largely dictated by the operational requirements of the army, is set out in the table at para 4.4 below:

4.3 The key development proposals of the ABP are as follows:

- New construction and refurbishment work to be undertaken mostly “behind the wire” on existing MOD bases. This will include single living accommodation (SLA), catering and extensive new build and some conversion of existing technical accommodation, including workshops, garages, armouries, stores and offices.
- Outside the bases approximately 1,100 new houses on MOD land, to accommodate service families – known as Service Family Accommodation (SFA) as detailed in the table below. The aim is to provide integrated and sustainable communities for both military and civilian families in line with local strategic planning guidance. The changes are to be centred round existing bases at Bulford, Perham Down/Ludgershall and Larkhill, and to a lesser extent Tidworth.
- Proposed development on the SPTA, to include a new electronic target range, a new Individual battle shooting range, an enhanced ‘backdoor access’ to SPTA at Bulford and an extension to the Royal Engineers Training Area.

4.4 The actual total number of SFA required is 1,117 and this will comprise:

- 100 units to be purchased from the market to de-risk the ABP supply, as this number of SFA is required by April 2015 and cannot be procured for construction in time available;
- 36 units required to replace existing stock in Bulford; and
- 1,081 units remaining requirement for ABP to be included in the Master Plan.

The conclusion of the Planning Context Report is that the SFA will be sited outside of the wire ideally in the areas within the table below:

| Location | Change | A2020 Liability | SFA Units |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Larkhill | +2053 | 3955 | 540 new |
| Bulford | +735 | 3453 | 277 new (inc. 36 rebuild) |
| Tidworth/Perham Down | +1236 | 5397 | 100 purchased |
| Upavon | +254 | 531 | 300 new |
| Total | +4278 | 13336 | 1,117 |

5. Master Plan - Detailed Proposals

5.1 The Master Plan does not aim to identify exact sites for development as its purpose is to provide a broader overview on where development may take place having regard to

operational requirements and the identified constraints and opportunities. That said, it does provide a level of detail which requires explanation as follows:

5.2 Larkhill

Proposed development at Larkhill within the wire includes living accommodation, amenity space, welfare facilities, administration/training resources and 'technical' facilities. The majority of single living accommodation will be to the north of the camp, with other development clustered around the centre and west of the site. Some existing buildings would be demolished. In total SLA will comprise 31 one, two or three-storey blocks.

5.3 Regarding SFA, the Master Plan acknowledges that due to the sensitivity of the WHS it will not be appropriate to develop south of the Packway. Equally, the Plan acknowledges that in view of the landscape sensitivity around Durrington, and concerns regarding coalescence of Larkhill and Durrington, land immediately to the west of Durrington should remain open. This leaves the sites to the north and west of the Stonehenge Golf Centre which are as close as practical to the base and which are large enough to meet the SFA need. To enable these sites to be considered for development, the army has agreed to relocate a firing area. The Master Plan states the following:

"The Larkhill proposal identifies how most of the calcareous grassland can be protected and structure landscape provided to enable the development to be integrated into the wider landscape. The boundary of the proposal area includes land for 540 SFA, public open space, protected grasslands, new school site, community facilities and the existing Golf Centre. The Golf Centre is not included in the suggested SFA development area at the present time, but should it become available it could mean that the northern boundary of housing as presently indicated could be repositioned further south.

The Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) chapter of the Overarching Environmental Appraisal includes impact assessments of the preferred sites. The selected site has been the subject of an initial LVIA to support the development, more detailed assessment will be undertaken as part of the landscape assessment to support the subsequent planning application.

As part of the planning application process, the next steps include detailed assessments of the study area to support delivery of the 540 SFA, additional new primary school and local facilities. It is acknowledged that Wiltshire Council's preference for primary education is for the existing school to be retained and a new two-form entry school provided, accommodating the relocation of Figheldean Primary School. Further studies will include detailed geophysical survey and, if required, trial trenching to ensure that there are no major historic structures within the proposed site. At the same time an assessment would be undertaken in Larkhill to identify how the existing school site and local facilities can be improved to complement the development on the north east. If the SFA studies conclude that not all of the 540

SFA can be delivered in this location, the remaining balance of SFA would be provided either in Bulford or by inclusion of the Golf Centre as an area for development”.

5.3 Bulford

Proposed development at Bulford camp inside the wire includes SLA, welfare facilities, administration/training resources and technical facilities including workshops and garages. Some buildings will be demolished. SLA will comprise 16 one, two or three storey blocks and refurbished existing buildings.

5.4 Outside the wire Bulford is constrained by its landscape sensitivity, proximity to heritage assets, the capacity of the road network, ecology and adequacy of local facilities. Two sites are identified for SFA at Bulford outside of the wire. The Master Plan states the following:

“The Bulford proposals plan 1 identifies a site off Bulford Road which could accommodate all 277 SFA, together with land for a public open space. The plan retains the existing footpaths and provides a landscape buffer around the archaeological assets on the land. Lower density housing would be located on the southern boundary of the site adjacent the open fields. A new road access provided close to the Canadian Estate off Bulford Road and from the south off Double Hedges Road or through the adjacent site B9, accessed from Newmans Way.

Bulford proposals plan 2 identifies the western part of B19, which is not part of the camp, together with the triangular site on the north (B12) for low density SFA to provide between 30 to 50 Officer SFA. The area requires more detailed, technical landscape and ecological assessment as part of the planning application process to determine the precise area of developable land, ensure a satisfactory relationship with listed buildings and safe road access.

This process would also identify the fallback location of any SFA that has not been possible to deliver in Larkhill”.

5.5 Tidworth

Proposed development at Tidworth inside the wire includes living accommodation, administration/training resources and technical facilities. Some existing buildings will be demolished. SLA will comprise 13 one, two or three story blocks.

5.6 SFA is not proposed at Tidworth in view of landscape constraints and difficulties in providing access to sites. The Master Plan states the following:

“Although initial studies indicated that the area may be able to accommodate about 175 houses, due to the above constraints and the proximity of more suitable land for development at Ludgershall, the 100 SFA, originally identified to serve the Tidworth Barracks as part of the total of the 200 required will be provided in Ludgershall. The balance of 100 houses of the 200 required will be purchased on the Riverbourne Fields development”.

5.7 Perham Down/(Ludgershall)

Proposed development at Perham Down includes living accommodation, amenity areas, administration/training resources and technical facilities. SLA will comprise 11 one, two or three storey blocks.

5.8 Outside the wire Perham Down and Ludgershall are constrained by heritage assets, ecology and the capacity of Wellington Academy (400+ dwellings would require expansion of the academy to beyond a maximum tolerable size of c.2000 pupils). The Ludgershall proposals plan – appendix 4b – identifies land at Corunna Barracks for 300 SFA together with land for a new primary school, public open space and local facilities.

5.9 Upavon

No new units are moving into Upavon although there would be a small uplift in personnel (254). Proposed development inside the wire includes living accommodation and office facilities. No new SFA is proposed at Upavon.

5.10 The Training Estate

Proposed development includes a new electronic target range in the Bulford Danger Area, an Individual Battle Shooting Range in the Central Impact Area, a new direct access point on to the SPTA from Bulford, a modified facility at Copehill Down, some infill at Imber Village, and moveable structures alongside the Complex Manoeuvre Environment between Copehill Down and Imber Village.

6. **Overarching Environmental Assessment (OEA)**

6.1 The Master Plan is accompanied by an OEA. This is the first step of the environmental assessment process, identifying the likelihood of significant effects based on the proposals and helping to scope and focus subsequent stages of the assessment process. Given the complexity of the project, which will require multiple planning applications including several Environmental Impact Assessments, the OEA will also act as a valuable framework providing the Council with clarity and confidence over the cumulative and synergistic effects of individual planning applications, helping to ensure timely, informed and robust decision making at the application stage. It has been informed by consultation and draws on a wealth of existing information and bespoke studies.

6.2 The Master Plan is also supported by a strategic Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Although the statutory requirement for HRA is not triggered by a document of this nature¹, it was agreed by DIO, statutory consultees and the Council that it would be prudent to carry out a HRA at an early stage in the planning process given the number of international designations potentially affected by the proposals and the strict requirements of the Habitats Directive. The Council is also required to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions, including its

¹ Endorsement of this plan does not amount to giving any consent, permission or other authorisation for the purposes of Regulation 61, and the masterplan does not meet the definition of a 'land use plan' (as set out in Regulation 107(1)) for the purposes of Regulation 102.

decision whether or not to endorse the masterplan document, and the strategic HRA document identifies the potential implications of the project for the international designations and demonstrates to the Council how these may be addressed. The Council will be required to carry out detailed HRAs of individual applications at the planning stage including 'in-combination' assessments. These in-combination assessments can be highly complex in a situation such as this involving multiple applications and designations; the strategic HRA will therefore provide the Council with a useful overarching assessment to assess the in-combination effects of all the applications, streamline the HRA process at the application stage, and help to ensure that such assessments are undertaken in a legally robust manner. A similar approach has been taken by the Council for the planned development Porton.

6.3 Each topic is considered using a methodology first agreed with the relevant consultees. From this, baseline conditions are defined and then significant effects arising from the proposals identified. The significant effects for each topic identified by the process are set out below:

6.4 Topic: Ecology and Nature Conservation

The OEA concludes that impacts may be anticipated to a varying degree across the development sites, principally in respect of chalk grassland, plantation, woodland and dense scrub habitats as well as to badgers, birds, reptiles, bats and terrestrial invertebrates, such as rare insects or snails. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“Various measures are available to mitigate for these potential impacts including the creation of habitat to replace land which will be developed and the translocation of animals to alternative sites in advance of works. In some cases, the timing of works can also be adjusted so that impacts, for example on breeding birds, are avoided. Recommendations have been made to offset or mitigate for all of the potential ecological impacts, and with the adoption of these measures the report considers that there would be no remaining significant effects on habitats or species.

A programme of monitoring has been recommended, to ensure that all of the mitigation measures are working as anticipated; if any unexpected problems are identified then further remedial action would be taken in partnership with stakeholders such as the Environment Agency or Natural England”.

Habitats Regulations Assessment – extract from OEA

“Due to the designation of Salisbury Plain and the River Avon as internationally important wildlife sites, it has been necessary to undertake an analysis (called a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)) of the potential impacts of ABP and military infrastructure on the internationally important interest features such as the chalk grassland, the marsh fritillary butterfly and stone curlew populations. An analysis to assist the DIO in making the assessment is contained within Chapter 18 of the OEA.

The analysis examines the direct impact of the Complex Manoeuvre Environment, Electronic Target Range and Individual Battle Shooting Range. It concludes that with appropriate mitigation (including chalk grassland habitat improvements and precautions over the delivery and management of the infrastructure) no significant effect would occur.

The analysis also considers the potential recreational impacts of the increased Army Basing population on the international ecological interest, alongside the housing set out in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and concludes that the mitigation already identified for the Core Strategy should be extended to the ABP.

The potential implications of a return to previous forms of military training on Salisbury Plain are considered and it is concluded that no significant effect would arise.

Water resource and quality impacts on the River Avon SAC are analysed. The analysis concludes that existing water abstraction issues relating to the River Avon require addressing and that subsequently to this no significant effect would arise from the ABP”.

This last conclusion is considered later in the report.

6.5 Topic: Cultural Heritage

The OEA concludes that a small proportion of the identified heritage assets have the potential to be significantly affected by the proposed developments. These include setting impacts on certain designated and undesignated remains near the south western recommended SFA site at Bulford. A preliminary finding is that the setting of some historic military buildings could be affected by proposed development behind the wire but the locations and designs of new buildings are not yet confirmed. At Larkhill, the potential for setting effects on the WHS has been investigated and significant effects were found to be unlikely. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“Further work has been proposed to avoid or reduce impacts on the identified heritage assets. In addition, archaeological field work is proposed in advance of development, to identify any buried archaeology”.

6.6 Topic: Soils, Groundwater and Surface Water

The OEA concludes that potential impacts on soils can occur as a result of land use change, compaction, erosion, rutting and spills and leaks. The Army’s projected training patterns are thought likely to have a negligible effect and, although the risk of pollution can never be entirely eliminated, standard construction site measures are sufficient to control the risk from spills or leaks to soils and underlying groundwater. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“Wessex Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity within their existing licence to abstract water to ensure a reliable supply to new housing, supplemented by the Veolia supply. Impacts on surface water may arise as a result of contamination, change in flow, the shape of the channel and water quality. However, in general, no significant effects on surface water were identified. Measures such as constructing the Nine Mile River crossing when it is dry (e.g. not flowing) were identified as a way of minimising the risk of pollution to the water environment.

The Environment Agency’s regional groundwater model shows that these abstractions, taken together with abstractions by other water users, may be having an adverse effect on the River Bourne and the Nine Mile River. For this reason the additional demand for water as a result of Army Basing was investigated in detail to

ensure that this situation was not going to be made worse. The modelling shows that the additional demand for water is expected to have a negligible effect on the surface water flows of the Nine Mile River and River Avon”.

6.7 Topic: Landscape and Visual

The OEA concludes that local landscape character at the recommended SFA sites in Bulford and Larkhill, which are of a predominantly rural character at present, would be unavoidably altered by the introduction of new housing. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“..... development would alter the rural views currently experienced from the footpath along the southern boundary of the south western SFA site at Bulford. The impact could be partially limited by screening the site with trees; however this would only be effective in the longer term.

There would be significant adverse visual effects on users of public byways to the north and on the western boundary of the SFA site at Larkhill. This is due to the loss of open views onto a rural landscape being replaced by views of a built-up area. However views towards Larkhill from Stonehenge would be unaffected as the proposed developments, including those behind the wire at Larkhill garrison, would not be visible”.

6.8 Topic: Ground Conditions

The OEA concludes that available evidence suggests any incidence of contamination from historic activities is localised and unlikely to lead to a more extensive pollution risk. Additional survey work has been proposed in some locations where SFA is proposed to be built on previously developed land, such as at Corunna Barracks. Mitigation measures have been recommended to control the risk of pollution during the construction and operation of the proposed developments, and with these measures it is considered unlikely that significant effects will arise in relation to ground conditions.

6.9 Topic: Noise and Vibration

The OEA concludes that, in general, no significant noise effects are expected. Whilst the garrisons will host more troops in future and the Army will use different equipment, it is expected that the level of training activity will remain within historic limits. Noise will continue to be managed as part of the sustainable training regime for Salisbury Plain and within existing Ministry of Defence commitments. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“Decommissioning (where this is required, such as at Corunna Barracks) and construction activities have the potential to result in adverse noise levels at nearby noise sensitive locations, such as homes and schools. Best practice noise mitigation measures have been recommended to minimise potential adverse effects. Further studies would be undertaken at SFA sites once a methodology for decommissioning and construction has been prepared.

Along the majority of local roads included in the operational traffic assessment a negligible change in traffic noise levels is predicted. The worst case effect is a minor adverse effect on three identified sections of road on the A3028 at Bulford and A345 south of Durrington.

Therefore, with suitable glazing and ventilation measures in place, internal noise criteria specified in British Standard 8233 are achievable at all of the recommended SFA sites for traffic noise. Recommended SFA sites that are adjacent to the Training Area may experience modest increases in noise levels during intensive training activities. Consequently, a higher standard of glazing may be needed to meet the British Standard in some houses”.

6.10 Topic: Air Quality

The OEA concludes that the impact of construction traffic has been estimated to result in, at worst, a small, temporary and localised increase in nitrogen dioxide concentrations. However as air quality is good across Salisbury Plain, all increases in construction traffic are expected to have a negligible effect on air quality.

- 6.11 The potential impacts on air quality once the troops are rebased and SFA is occupied have also been modelled around Bulford, Larkhill, Tidworth, Perham Down and Upavon. The greatest impact has been estimated in the Larkhill area; however given the generally good air quality, all increases in road traffic are expected to have a negligible effect on air quality. The non-technical summary to the OEA states:

“Overall, the proposed development, including measures to offset adverse effects during construction, is not expected to adversely affect amenity and local air quality around Salisbury Plain”.

6.12 Topic: Socio-economics and Community

The OEA concludes that although the effect on the local job market is predicted to be negligible in terms of pressure on jobs and wages, the influx of additional personnel and their families is likely to have a significant beneficial effect on the local economy resulting from higher retail and leisure spending. Total increase in spending could be over £30 million per year as a result, although some of this spending would be outside the local economy. The non-technical summary to the OEA further states:

“Although there may be an increase in total crime and anti-social behaviour expected with any incoming population, there is no evidence to suggest that the increase in the military population would alter overall crime rates. The permanent relocation of Army personnel to Salisbury Plain may indeed provide increased community stability and cohesion which would be expected to have a beneficial effect on crime rates.

Incoming service families will create a significant increase in demand for school places after 2017. Similarly there will be an increase in demand for health services, estimated to be in the region of 1-2 doctors and 1-2 dentists”.

6.13 Topic: Transport and Access

The OEA concludes that the traffic on roads around Bulford, Perham Down and Larkhill are projected to increase as a result of the proposed developments, although measures to improve traffic flow such as junction improvements are recommended in the Outline Transport Assessment. No significant effects on traffic are anticipated.

No significant effects are anticipated in relation to access and public rights of way, since only a few pathways would be affected and only one of these, at the site of the proposed new Electronic Target Range at Bulford, is likely to be the subject of temporary closures.

6.14 Synergistic and Cumulative Effects

The OEA states that its review of planning applications identified several developments of the scale that required further investigation. However it was found that these planning applications were either still in the process of being determined (not 'committed development') or were too far away from the proposed ABP developments to have an in combination effect.

It was noted that there was a risk of short term synergistic effects upon amenity (noise, dust or adverse visual effects) for residents living near the proposed SFA site for Perham Down. This was because the Corunna Barracks would need to be demolished before construction could begin. The OEA recommends that the Construction Environmental Management Plan should pay particular attention to this issue.

6.15 Summary of Residual Effects

The non-technical summary to the OEA summarises the residual effects of the Master Plan proposals in the following terms:

“Residual effects are those significant adverse environmental effects that remain once all proposed measures to avoid or offset these effects have been implemented. A preliminary assessment of residual effects is presented in the Overarching Environmental Appraisal, however it should be understood that these adverse effects may be able to be avoided depending on how developments are designed or built in practice.

Although the Salisbury Plain Masterplan has been developed with a focus on avoiding impacts on cultural heritage assets, it appears likely that some of the ancient barrows to the south of the proposed Service Family Accommodation at Bulford would have their setting adversely affected by the new housing, although they would not be damaged physically.

Also, because Salisbury Plain is rich in archaeology, there is also the potential for loss to buried remains at all locations where new development is proposed. Archaeological works, such as geophysical surveys and trial trenches are proposed to offset this risk and, to learn more about any remains that are found as a result.

At certain garrisons there is a risk that the setting of some listed buildings, such as the Avon Club at Upavon, may be affected by the introduction of new buildings nearby. However it should be understood that these new military buildings would not be out of context with their surroundings, which after all is that of a military base. English Heritage will be consulted as the design work progresses to ensure that any such setting impacts are limited as far as possible.

The landscape and visual impact assessment has identified some loss of views from the footpaths around the recommended Service Family Accommodation sites at Larkhill and at Bulford. There is also the likelihood that a footpath which crosses the proposed location of the new Electronic Target Range at Bulford would need to be closed at certain times when the range is in use.

With the exceptions noted above, however, significant adverse environmental effects as a result of the Salisbury Plain Masterplan have been shown to be unlikely and it is possible that further work could help reduce these adverse residual effects. It should also be noted that the Overarching Environmental Appraisal identified that the arrival of new families in the Salisbury Plain area and expenditure on construction by the Ministry of Defence should have a moderately beneficial effect on the local economy”.

7 Planning Policy Context

- 7.1 The adopted development plan for those areas affected by the Master Plan comprises the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS) (incorporating ‘saved’ policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan (SDLP)) for South Wiltshire (particularly Larkhill and Bulford); and the Kennet Local Plan (KLP) for East Wiltshire (particularly Tidworth and Ludgershall).
- 7.2 The emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (eWCS) will set out policies for the entire county. As it is at an advanced stage in the plan making process it must be given significant weight.
- 7.3 Core Policy 37 of the eWCS relates specifically to military establishments. It is generally permissive of new development at operational facilities. The policy states the following:

New development and changes of use at operational facilities that help enhance or sustain their operational capability will be supported.

Redevelopment, conversion or change of use of redundant MoD sites and buildings will be supported provided they are well related to an existing settlement in terms of both location and scale. Sites that are remote from settlements should only be considered where the existing buildings and infrastructure on the site are suitable for redevelopment, conversion or change of use. Redevelopment proposals will not exceed the existing building footprint and floorspace unless they are well located to an existing settlement. The focus will be on employment-led development and other

uses should be determined through a masterplanning approach with the local community.

Development at operational or redundant sites should enhance the overall character of the site. All development at operational or redundant sites should mitigate any adverse impacts on local infrastructure, and not erode the character of the surrounding area. All proposals must ensure that the cultural and historical significance of the military facilities located on the site are understood and inform the scope of future development of that site.

- 7.4 The explanatory notes accompanying Core Policy 37 add the following:

Applications for the development of operational facilities which conflict with other policies in the Core Strategy must be accompanied by a reasoned justification as to why the development should nonetheless be considered suitable. During the plan period, provision of new housing on MOD land to accommodate military personnel including service family accommodation and other operational facilities will be required as a result of the Army Rebasing on Salisbury Plan (Army 2020). A single master plan should be developed with the Council including front loaded consultation and partnership working with the local community and other stakeholders. The master plan should address these requirements and ensure that infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development is an integral part of any planned development in accordance with Core Policy 37, as well as other policy requirements within the plan.

- 7.5 The eWCS is at an advanced stage having been submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2012. There has been no indication at either the Examination in Public or in the Council's correspondence with the Inspector that Core Policy 37 is in anyway inconsistent with the NPPF. Although there are some existing objections, these are not considered to be significant and are generally concerned with redevelopment of redundant military facilities. It is considered that Core Policy 37 is consistent with the NPPF and given the advanced stage of the Plan's production can be given significant weight in the decision making process.

- 7.6 'Saved' Policy G12 of the SDLP also relates to military establishments and states the following:

Where Ministry of Defence establishments are situated within or adjacent to a settlement, or form a recognisable built-up area in their own right, the Local Planning Authority will not object to new defence related development within or adjoining the existing MOD site boundaries where the development would be in accordance with the policies of this Local Plan.

- 7.7 The Kennet Local Plan does not contain any policies specifically related to military development.

- 7.8 Other relevant policies of the development plan include those seeking to protect the environment and ensure additional infrastructure made necessary by new development is provided. These policies include the following:

SWCS –

- CP1: Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth
- CP19: Water efficiency & River Avon SAC
- CP20: Pollution & phosphate levels in the water environment
- CP22: Green infrastructure & habitat networks

SDLP –

- G1: Sustainable development
- G2: General criteria for development
- G3: Water – adequate supply
- G5: Water – adequate supply, drainage and sewage treatment
- G8: Groundwater source protection areas
- G9: Planning obligations
- D1: Design – extensive development
- H23: Undeveloped land outside settlements
- CN20: Scheduled Ancient Monuments/nationally important archaeological features
- CN21: Archaeology
- CN22: Archaeology
- CN24: Stonehenge WHS
- C2: Countryside protection
- C11-18: Wildlife and natural features
- R2: Recreational open space in new development
- R4: Indoor recreational facilities

KLP –

- PD1: General criteria for development
- HC26: Housing in the countryside
- HC34: Recreation provision on large housing sites
- HC37, 39-40: Demand for education
- HC42: Additional social & community needs
- HC43: Off-site service infrastructure
- NR1-5: Wildlife and natural features
- NR6: Protection of countryside
- NR7: Protection of landscape
- NR14-16: Water – supply

eWCS –

- CP1: Settlement Strategy
- CP2: Delivery Strategy
- CP3: Infrastructure requirements
- CP50: Biodiversity and geo-diversity
- CP51: Landscape
- CP52: Green infrastructure

CP58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment
CP59: Stonehenge, Avebury and associated WHS sites and its setting
CP60: Sustainable transport
CP61: Transport and development
CP62: Development impacts on the transport network
CP68: Water resources
CP69: Protection of the River Avon SAC

7.9 National planning policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Relevant paragraphs are summarised as follows:

- The NPPF recognises the need for local authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing in order to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Local authorities should “plan for a mix of housing ... based on the needs of different groups in the community (such as...service families)”, (paragraph 50).
- The NPPF prioritises the reuse of previously developed (brownfield) land over greenfield and green belt land (paragraph 111).
- The NPPF encourages LPA’s to “work with the MOD’s Strategic Planning Team to ensure that they take into account the up-to-date information about defence and security needs in their area”, (paragraph 164).
- Creating healthy and inclusive communities through an integrated approach to housing, economic uses and community facilities/services (paragraphs 69 and 70).
- In terms of transport, one of the core planning principles is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable (paragraph 34).
- The NPPF states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and that developments should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. The document also states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe (paragraph 32).
- Paragraph 118 states that proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) that is likely to have an adverse effect on a SSSI should not normally be permitted. Exceptions should only be made where the benefits of the development outweigh the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the SSSI and any broader impact on the national network of SSSIs.
- Substantial harm or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance such as scheduled monuments, and World Heritage Sites should be wholly exceptional (paragraph 132).

- The planning system should play a role in preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability (paragraph 109).
- The NPPF also provides guidance on flood risk (paragraphs 100 to 104), the natural environment (paragraphs 109 to 125) and heritage (paragraphs 126 to 141).

The development plan policies, NPPF and NPPG are referred to in greater detail later in this report.

8. Stakeholder and Community Engagement

8.1 Stakeholder and community consultation has been carried out as an integral part of the master planning process. Responses received have helped to inform the selection of the proposed development sites.

8.2 Stakeholders consulted comprise the following:

- Local Authorities (WC, HCC, TVDC)
- Statutory Consultees (EH, NE, EA, HA, etc.)
- Infrastructure Providers
- Education Providers
- Health Providers
- Area Boards
- Town and Parish Councils
- Community Groups
- The public
- Army HQ and subordinate commands
- Tenanted farmers, agricultural licensees and leaseholders

8.3 Initial consultations on the scope of the Master Plan carried out by DIO took place between 27th November 2012 and 6th June 2013. This involved meetings with local bodies, drop-in exhibitions at key locations and targeted questionnaires. Consultation material was made available on the Wiltshire Council and central government websites. A formal six week consultation period took place between 19th February and 1 April 2014, preceded by a public meeting. Outcomes from both of these stages are set out in a Statement of Community Involvement, and where appropriate the Master Plan has been changed to accommodate them. A final consultation period ran from 20th May to 17th June 2014.

8.4 Over 300 responses from the public were received as a result of the six week consultation exercise with key issues raised set out below:

- Sufficient social infrastructure such as schools and retail facilities needs to be delivered in conjunction with SFA;
- Impact on A303 – exacerbating the issue of ‘rat-running’ on local roads;

- Potential noise disturbance from additional training activities;
- Green buffer required between Larkhill and Durrington to avoid coalescence;
- Development of brownfield land supported south of Packway, Larkhill;
- Retain woodland in Bulford;
- Threat to the sun gap view from Stonehenge to Larkhill;
- Impact on local businesses;
- Potential for traffic congestion in Bulford.

An extract from the SCI setting out a complete summary list of the public representations and DIO responses to these is attached at appendix 2.

- 8.5 Responses from statutory consultees and other stakeholders received during the final consultation period are summarised in **Appendix 4** to this report.
- 8.6 Where reasonable, matters raised at the first two consultation stages have been addressed in the latest version of the Master Plan. For example, shortfalls in school places are to be addressed through contributions towards expansion of existing schools or provision of new facilities, and a 'green buffer' is to be retained between Larkhill and Durrington.
- 8.7 The final formal comments stage ran between 20th May and 17th June 2014. Comments received during this period will be recorded and addressed, where appropriate, at the planning applications stage.
- 8.8 Where particular issues remain outstanding this is acknowledged in the Master Plan. Of course, it remains the case that such issues will need to be satisfactorily resolved before planning permissions for the respective developments could be granted.
- 8.9 Overall, it is considered that the stakeholder and community engagement programme has been thorough, and the outcomes largely addressed in the Master Plan and related documents. The exceptions are issues relating to water abstraction and foul water discharge, and these are considered in more detail below. As stated above, the Master Plan acknowledges that some additional assessments will be required as part of the later planning application process for individual sites.

9. Planning Issues

- 9.1 The issues to be considered are, firstly, from a procedural perspective, whether or not the Master Plan has gone through a sufficiently robust process to enable the Council to endorse it as a material consideration; and secondly, and assuming the process is found to be robust, whether or not it should be given weight as a material consideration anyway having regard to its broad proposals and their acceptability or otherwise to the Council as local planning authority.

9.2 Master Plan process

On the first issue, it is evident from the summary of events already set out in this report that the Master Plan has been prepared on the back of a vast array of supporting technical reports and investigations. It is also evident that extensive consultations have ensured that the Plan has been subject to thorough scrutiny by both key stakeholders and the public, and that it has evolved as a consequence of this. It is also relevant that the Master Plan and its broad outcomes are anticipated by the eWCS, which itself carries significant weight.

9.3 Under these circumstances it is considered that the Master Plan, if endorsed, would carry weight. It follows that the Master Plan could, indeed, be endorsed by the Council as a material consideration in the planning application process.

9.4 Material Considerations – interpretation and relevance

Planning law requires local planning authorities to determine applications in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. If the development plan contains material policies or proposals and there are no other material considerations then planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan. Where there are other material considerations, the development plan should be the starting point, and other material considerations should be taken into account in reaching a decision. Such considerations will include whether the plan policies are relevant and up to date, and whether there are other planning documents, such as a master plan, which are relevant.

9.5 Case law relating to material considerations states that *“in principle ... any consideration which relates to the use and development of land is capable of being a planning consideration. Whether a particular consideration falling within that broad class is material in any given case will depend on the circumstances”*, (Stringer v MHLG 1971). Material considerations must be genuine planning considerations - that is, they must be related to the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must also fairly and reasonably relate to the planning application(s) concerned, (R v Westminster CC ex-parte Monahan 1989).

9.6 Principle of the ABP – strategic level

In both a national and international context Salisbury Plain is very much associated with the army. Army camps have existed on and around the plain for many decades, perhaps most notably at Tidworth and Bulford where military camps first materialised in the latter years of the nineteenth century. Over time the various camps have changed depending on the requirements of the occupying forces – they have grown or shrunk, adapted and evolved. By way of example, in more recent years this evolution has included Project Allenby Connaught which has seen large scale re-development of the Tidworth camp and provision of new training facilities on the plain. In many respects the current ABP comprises the latest evolution, following the well established tradition of change.

9.7 In planning policy terms the NPPF is a material consideration. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development, and that this has three dimensions – economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles defined as follows:

- *“an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*
- *a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- *an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”.*

9.8 The NPPF points out that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation as they are mutually dependent. It further states:

“Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life, including (but not limited to):

- *making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;*
- *moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature;*
- *replacing poor design with better design;*
- *improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and*
- *widening the choice of high quality homes.*

Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas”.

9.9 The ‘golden thread’ running through the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

9.10 Wiltshire’s adopted development plan for the ABP area is split between the SWCS (incorporating the ‘saved’ policies of the SDLP) for South Wiltshire and the KLP for

East Wiltshire. With the exception of SDLP Policy G12 which is supportive of defence related development when in accordance with other policies, these Plans are largely silent on the subject. The NPPF advises that decisions should be made in the following ways:

“For decision-taking

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
 - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
 - *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted”.*

9.11 Notwithstanding the content of the adopted development plan, the eWCS does contain an up-to-date policy for defence related development in CP37 referred to previously. Of key relevance to the matter of principle is the following extract from supporting paragraph 6.23:

“..... During the plan period, provision of new housing on MOD land to accommodate military personnel including service family accommodation and other operational facilities will be required as a result of the Army Rebasing on Salisbury Plan (Army 2020)”.

Although an emerging core strategy, the eWCS is at an advanced stage and its policies can be afforded significant weight. The eWCS defines the intended direction of travel of Wiltshire Council in terms of its planning responsibilities and, as is evident from Policy CP37, this is to support the principle of appropriate new development at military sites, including that required as a consequence of the ABP. It is important to note that this ‘in principle’ support remains subject to other infrastructure needs made necessary by the ABP being provided for and other policies requirements of the Plan being satisfied.

9.12 In terms of the broad principle, it is considered that ABP is acceptable within the Wiltshire context. In the first instance ABP ‘fits’ with the tradition of an evolving military presence in the county. In the second instance it is supported by the NPPF in terms of that documents presumption in favour of sustainable development taking account of local circumstances. And in the third instance ABP is not specifically precluded by the adopted development plan, and is positively supported in the emerging plan (indeed, the eWCS requires a Master Plan to be prepared to inform the ABP planning application process). In principle, therefore, it is not considered that there are any demonstrable reasons to resist the proposals for army basing in Wiltshire in their

broadest terms. This is subject to ABP adequately addressing its infrastructure impacts and meeting other development plan policy requirements, as expanded on below.

9.13 Of course, there are many detailed matters to consider in addition to the broad principle, but these are primarily for the later planning applications. As previously stated, the Master Plan will inform each application by defining the wider context and assessing the cumulative impacts, and so demonstrating in the broadest terms how and where development can, and cannot, take place. Critically, endorsement of the Master Plan would not be tantamount to the granting of any form of planning permission and nor would it fetter the Council's consideration of future ABP planning applications. The Master Plan would, however, provide the Council with a 'baseline' against which the future ABP applications would be judged, this particularly in terms of the opportunities and the constraints the Plan defines.

9.14 That said, as is evident the Master Plan does go as far as to indicate potential areas for development. With this in mind the following paragraphs explain how these areas have been assessed in terms of the OEA topics.

9.15 Ecology (including water abstraction and foul water discharge)

All of the ABP defined areas for potential development lie adjacent to (in the case of the camps and SFA sites) or at least partly within (in the case of the various new elements of training infrastructure) the Salisbury Plain Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Salisbury Plain Special Protection Area (SPA), the two international sites being largely contiguous with each other. Some of the elements are also in the vicinity of the River Avon SAC. Additionally Salisbury Plain supports a number of SSSI's, and in the vicinity of Bulford there are various locally designated Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). There are also protected species in the area, including birds on the Schedule 1 list.

9.16 The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by '*minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures*' and should prevent '*unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution*'. In addition, the NPPF states that '*In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment*'.

9.17 The NPPF further states that:

'When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- *If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;*

- *Proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;*
- *Development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;*
- *Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;*
- *Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss; and*
- *The following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites:*
 - *Potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;*
 - *Listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and*
 - *Sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites'.*

9.18 Policies CP50 and CP69 of the eWCS are the particularly relevant emerging local policies, stating the following:

Policy CP50: Biodiversity and Geo-diversity -

Local sites

Sustainable development will avoid direct and indirect impacts upon local sites through sensitive site location and layout, and by maintaining sufficient buffers and ecological connectivity with the wider environment. Damage or disturbance to local sites will generally be unacceptable, other than in exceptional circumstances where it has been demonstrated that such impacts:

- i. Cannot reasonably be avoided*
- ii. Are reduced as far as possible*
- iii. Are outweighed by other planning considerations in the public interest and*

iv. *Where appropriate compensation measures can be secured through planning obligations or agreements.*

Development proposals affecting local sites must contribute to their favourable management in the long-term.

Protection

Development proposals must demonstrate how they protect, and where possible enhance, features of nature conservation and geological value as part of the design rational. There is an expectation that such features shall be retained, buffered, and managed favourably in order to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. Where it has been demonstrated that such features cannot be retained, removal or damage shall only be acceptable in circumstances where the anticipated ecological impacts have been mitigated as far as possible and appropriate compensatory measures can be secured to ensure no net loss of the local biodiversity resource, and secure the integrity of local ecological networks and provision of ecosystem services.

Biodiversity enhancement

All development should seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Major development in particular must include measures to deliver biodiversity gains through opportunities to restore, enhance and create valuable habitats, ecological networks and ecosystem services. Such enhancement measures will contribute to the objectives and targets of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP), particularly through landscape scale projects, and be relevant to the local landscape character.

Disturbance

All development proposals shall incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and reduce disturbance of sensitive wildlife species and habitats throughout the lifetime of the development. Development likely to increase recreational pressure on SPAs will be required to deliver an appropriate level of mitigation to offset any potential impacts. Suitable mitigation strategies will include securing management measures for designated features of Salisbury Plain, New Forest National Park and surrounding areas. Designated features include Habitats Directive Annex I habitats and Annex II species. Provision of an appropriate area of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace to deter public use of Natura 2000 sites will only be acceptable in exceptional circumstances.

Policy CP69: Protection of the River Avon SAC -

In order to avoid and reduce potential environmental effects on the River Avon SAC, development will need to incorporate measures during construction and operation to avoid and prevent pollution and mitigate potential disturbance effects; appropriate schemes of mitigation may include consideration of suitable buffer zones along watercourses, habitat enhancements and river access management measures. All development within 20m of the river banks should submit a Construction Management Plan to the Local Planning Authority to ensure measures proposed

during construction are satisfactory. Where additional sewage discharges to a STW cannot be accommodated without measures to offset phosphate loading, development will be required to undertake proportionate mitigation measures to demonstrate that the proposals would have no likely significant effects upon the SAC.

Similar policies are set out in the SWCS (SDLP) and KLP.

- 9.19 As referred to earlier in this report, the Master Plan is accompanied by the OEA which sets out the survey work undertaken to assess the impacts of the ABP on ecology. The OEA concludes that measures are available to mitigate potential impacts, including the creation of habitat to replace land which will be developed and the translocation of animals to alternative sites in advance of works. This broad outcome is accepted by the WC Ecologist who agrees that there appears to be no species or habitats directly impacted by the works that would prevent the recommended options being pursued, and considers that the study will be helpful in agreeing where further survey and assessment work should be targeted to support later planning applications. This is subject to the following comments relating to the HRA in particular.
- 9.20 The WC Ecologist and the Environment Agency note that there are still studies to be undertaken which is necessary to further inform the detail of the planning applications². This is referenced in the OEA extract set out at paragraph 5.3 above – specifically, the OEA states that, to satisfy the HRA, “... existing water abstraction issues relating to the River Avon require addressing”. The WC Ecologist also notes that the HRA report identifies “likely significant effects” on some protected sites as a result of habitat loss and disturbance to breeding bird populations on the plain, and potential impacts arising from additional foul water discharge. Although the initial HRA work suggests that it should be possible for the ABP to be delivered without having adverse effects, further work will be required to assess the actual impacts and to ensure that any / sufficient mitigation measures can be secured; this will be confirmed through detailed HRAs at the application stage. The WC Ecologist considers they should be addressed by determination of the first application so that in-combination effects can be fully addressed within the detailed HRAs. In relation to the outstanding water abstraction issue the Environment Agency considers this should be resolved in advance of planning applications being submitted. The recommendation in respect of the Master Plan is worded with regard to these responses.
- 9.21 Specific concerns relate to the impact of additional water abstraction on the River Bourne / Nine Mile River and ponds, which at this time has not been adequately modelled; and the impact of foul water discharge on phosphate levels in the rivers, which again has not been adequately modelled to confirm that the ABP will operate within existing permit levels. Also, the increase in recreational pressure on the plain stemming from additional development requires assessment, and appropriate levels of mitigation provided to off-set the impacts on protected species, primarily stone curlews.

² DIO has produced responses to the issues raised by EA, NE & the WC Ecologist, and these are attached at appendix 3. At the time of writing further representations from EA, NE & the WC Ecologist had not been received.

9.22 Natural England (NE) and the Environment Agency raise similar points to those made by the WC Ecologist in relation to abstraction and mitigation. In addition, NE questions the extent of the 'study area' used for site selection – which is MoD land within 10 miles of the camps. A 10 mile radius has been chosen primarily because the MoD considers it to be a reasonable travel-to-work distance, in accordance with its own working regulations. This approach by the MoD is considered to be perfectly reasonable and fully in accordance with the principles of sustainability which seek to reduce travel. It is also unnecessary to extend the search area further if it can be demonstrated that the ABP can be accommodated locally without harm to ecology interests in any event.

9.23 Impact on heritage assets

The ABP search area supports an array of historic assets including the world heritage site, other ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, conservation areas, listed buildings, and other above and below ground archaeology. The camps themselves also support important 'modern' military assets of interest.

9.24 The NPPF recognises that heritage assets are irreplaceable and that where proposed development may impact on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be placed on their conservation; the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Substantial harm to or loss of assets of the highest significance - for example scheduled monuments, registered battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and World Heritage Sites - should be wholly exceptional. The NPPF notes that alteration or destruction of a heritage asset or development within its setting can harm its significance. Where substantial harm is found, substantial public benefits must be achieved to outweigh the loss.

9.25 When establishing the parameters of what constitutes substantial harm, the NPPG points to total destruction being the most '*obvious*' cause of substantial harm. Anything less than this should be judged on its own merits. Partial destruction may remove elements of an asset which were detrimental to its significance and therefore may not be harmful at all. When discussing works that are moderate or minor in scale, the NPPG advises that these are '*likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all*'. The importance of considering each development on its own merits is reinforced by the statement that even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm to an assets' significance.

9.26 The NPPF states that the effect of a planning application on non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account when considering new development. It sets out the need for a balanced judgement between the significance of the heritage assets and the scale of any harm or loss, when considering assets directly or indirectly affected by proposed development. The NPPF recognises that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest may be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument. In such cases the NPPF directs that such assets are to be considered subject to the policies for designated assets.

9.27 Development with the potential to impact upon World Heritage Sites or their setting is also addressed by the NPPF. The NPPF states the importance for local planning authorities to treat more favourably those proposals which seek to preserve the elements of the setting which make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of World Heritage Sites. It further recognises that not all elements of a World Heritage Site contribute to its significance. It requires local planning authorities to carefully look at development proposals which could impact upon World Heritage Sites and if the loss or removal of any part of an element or building which contributes to the significance is proposed, the test of substantial or less than substantial harm should apply as appropriate to the asset, and its contribution to the overall significance. Conversely then, the removal of a structure or element which does not contribute to the overall significance should be viewed more favourably.

9.28 Policy CP58 of the eWCS sets out emerging local policy for conservation. It states the following:

Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment.

Designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance including:

- i. nationally significant archaeological remains*
- ii. World Heritage Sites within and adjacent to Wiltshire*
- iii. buildings and structures of special architectural or historic interest*
- iv. the special character or appearance of conservation areas*
- v. historic parks and gardens*
- vi. important landscapes, including registered battlefields and townscapes.*

Distinctive elements of Wiltshire's historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to a sense of local character and identity, will be conserved and where possible enhanced. The potential contribution of these heritage assets towards wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits will also be utilised where this can be delivered in a sensitive and appropriate manner, in accordance with Core Policy 58

9.29 Policy CP59 of the eWCS relates specifically to the WHS. It states the following:

The Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the World Heritage Site will be sustained by:

- i. giving precedence to the protection of the World Heritage Site and its setting.*
- ii. development not adversely affecting the World Heritage Site and its attributes of OUV. This includes the physical fabric, character, appearance, setting or views into or out of the World Heritage Site.*
- iii. seeking opportunities to support and maintain the positive management of the World Heritage Site through development that delivers improved conservation,*

presentation and interpretation and reduces the negative impact of roads, traffic and visitor pressure.

- iv. requiring developments to demonstrate that full account has been taken of their impact upon the World Heritage Site and its setting. Proposals will need to demonstrate that the development will have no individual, cumulative or consequential adverse effect upon the site and its OUV. Consideration of opportunities for enhancing the World Heritage Site and sustaining its OUV should also be demonstrated. This will include proposals for climate change mitigation and renewable energy schemes.*

9.30 The OEA assesses the impact of ABP on heritage assets. It concludes that although many of the assets defined in the OEA would not be significantly affected by the ABP, some are likely to be significantly affected, although in most cases mitigation is possible to reduce the significance. These broad conclusions are accepted by the WC Conservation Officer and English Heritage whose initial comments have already helped to shape the Master Plan.

9.31 Particularly noteworthy changes to the Master Plan following consultations include removal of potential SFA sites to the north of the Durrington Walls Scheduled Monument, re-positioning of the SFA site to the east of Larkhill and removal of a potential site close to the Ludgershall Castle Scheduled Monument. As a consequence of the changes, and having regard to the proposed mitigation, English Heritage in particular does not object to the Master Plan in principle (subject to the final comment below). It does, however, require adequate Heritage Impact Assessments and mitigation strategies to be presented at the planning application stage. This is particularly so in relation to the Larkhill SFA to confirm that development at this location can be achieved without harming the setting and context of the WHS or of the monuments within it.

9.32 With specific regard to the World Heritage Site, it already has the Larkhill camp as an established part of its setting. The OEA acknowledges the importance of the landscape within and beyond the WHS as an integral part of it. It also refers to the important views northwards which include the view of the “sun gap” from Stonehenge. The OEA states:

“... The northern edge of the field marks the limits of the WHS. Towards the eastern end of the northern limits of the WHS (the roundabout end), views are currently partially restricted by the hedge that borders the southern side of The Packway but views northward from the north western edge of the WHS would contain the SFA development, however the landscape proposals should ensure that the development is only seen within the existing context of the garrison, rather than joining to Durrington to the east. The magnitude of impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site is therefore judged to be low”.

In view of the significance of the WHS and the conclusion of the OEA that landscape proposals *should* ensure that the development is only seen within the context of the garrison, and also in view of the reserved judgement on this by English Heritage, the

recommendation for endorsement of this element of the Master Plan is subject to the visual impacts being adequately demonstrated at the later planning application stage.

- 9.33 In broad terms the visual impact of new development on the *setting* of assets is noted to be 'medium' to 'high' in some instances. For example, the group of nine barrows south of Bulford retain an un-developed setting, but this will change where SFA would come closer. Mitigation is proposed in the form of landscaping in particular, and its adequacy to reduce the significance of the impacts will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage.
- 9.34 The impacts of new development on non-designated assets, including unknown underground archaeology and some older military developments, are noted to be 'very high' in a number of areas. For example, in relation to archaeology the OEA acknowledges that the construction of technical buildings inside the wire at Bulford camp has the potential to permanently impact on Bronze Age archaeology; and in relation to older military developments there are 'concrete structures' within the SFA area at Larkhill which are likely to be removed. In relation to non-designated military developments the OEA concludes that the impact on these would be 'very high', but that their value lies in their archaeological and historic value and the evidence they can provide for the evolution of military technology and tactics, which can be recorded.
- 9.35 As for the underground archaeology, it is intended that more intensive archaeology groundwork will be carried out at the planning application stage, and this will inform the detailed locations of new development in any event. This addresses the WC Archaeologist's concern that changes to proposed sites may become necessary should significant unknown archaeology materialise. The recommendation is drafted to reflect this.
- 9.36 An outstanding area of concern relates to the Larkhill Sewage Treatment Works. English Heritage has stated that it considers there is little or no scope to extend or enlarge this facility if made necessary by the ABP in view of its location at the heart of the WHS and in view of its proximity to the Neolithic Cursus. The recommendation is drafted with regard to this objection.
- 9.37 Impact on highway safety
In terms of policy, the NPPF states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and that developments should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. It also states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 9.38 Development Plan policies set out similar objectives, namely:
- To reduce growth in the length and number of motorised journeys.
 - To locate new development where it can be accessed by sustainable transport.

- To ensure new development provides facilities for sustainable travel and encourages greater use of walking and cycling, particularly for short journeys.
- To reduce the impact of HGVs.
- To manage traffic to decrease congestion, improve air quality, reduce visual intrusion and noise.
- To improve the integration of different transport modes.
- To ensure that new parking provision does not encourage high levels of car use.

9.39 The Master Plan is accompanied by an Outline Transport Assessment (OTA) and a Framework Travel Plan (FTP). The purpose of the OTA is to identify the strategic transport implications of the ABP and to demonstrate that the Master Plan proposals are acceptable on transport grounds. It, therefore, examines transport implications at a 'high level' and identifies the new/improved strategic transport infrastructure required to mitigate any adverse transport impacts. The study area for the OTA covers the A303(T), A338, A360, A345, A3028, A3026, A346 and A342.

9.40 The methodology used in the OTA is to compare existing conditions with predicted conditions post ABP. Existing conditions have been measured by way of new AM/PM peak period traffic surveys carried out at the beginning of March 2014. The surveys comprised classified turning counts at key junctions and 7-day automatic traffic surveys on key links. Predicted conditions have been measured by undertaking a new traffic survey at an existing SFA development – namely, the Canadian Estate, Bulford. The survey was undertaken for a week long period at the end of February 2014. The Canadian Estate was chosen in view of its location close to the Bulford camp and its 'model' sustainable characteristics. The recorded trip rates from the Canadian Estate have been used to predict the likely similar vehicular trips generated by the new SFA. Trip types comprise military commuter trips, non-military commuter trips, education related trips and other trips (shopping, healthcare, leisure related, etc.).

9.41 Data relating to anticipated increases in vehicle movements to/from camps has been estimated from vehicle flows, adjusted pro rata in accordance with the proposed increase in personnel at each camp. Existing flows were taken from preliminary TA reports produced in November 2013 which include ATC surveys at the camp entrance points. Construction traffic has also been factored into the data, and increases in traffic in general.

9.42 The OTA provides an analysis of the collected 'before' and 'after' trip data, and this reveals 'material impacts' at the following road junctions:

- A3026 Tidworth Road/A342 High Street/A342 Andover Road
- A3026 Tidworth Road/Somme Road
- Somme Road/Station Road
- A338 Pennings Road/A3026 Ludgershall Road
- A338 Pennings Road/Meerut Road
- A338 Park Road/Station Road
- A303(T)/A338
- A303(T)/A3028 Double Hedges

- A303(T)/Amesbury Road
- A303(T)/Salisbury Road/Porton Road
- A3028 High Street/Salisbury Road/Double Hedges
- A3028 High Street/Orchard End
- A345 Countess Road/A3028 Larkhill Road/The Packway
- A303(T)/A345 'Countess Roundabout'
- B3086/The Packway

The OTA also anticipates a material impact at the two existing mini-roundabout junctions on the A338 at Tidworth which were not surveyed.

9.43 The OTA observes that in percentage terms the increase in traffic at other locations in the study area is relatively low, or in the case of Upavon it is only high because of very low background traffic flows. The OTA also observes that no material impacts are forecast on the single carriageway section of the A303(T) past Stonehenge. In this regard the OTA states:

“.... The proposed rebasing programme is ... not anticipated to materially affect existing traffic conditions on this link and as a result is not expected to contribute towards any potential 'knock-on' traffic issues on adjacent local roads when this section of the Trunk Road is close to its operational link capacity during the busier summer months”.

9.44 With the areas affected by 'material impacts' identified the OTA then examines their actual capacities to absorb additional traffic. The outcome of this is preliminary designs (not final) for potential highway improvements at 8 of the junctions (7 in Wiltshire; 1 in Hampshire). This figure may reduce if sustainable travel measures are also introduced via a Travel Plan.

9.45 The potentially affected junctions are –

- Porton Road / Solstice Park Ave / London Road junction – localised widening on the Solstice Park Ave / Porton Road (south) arms of the roundabout.
- A345 Countess Road / A3028 Larkhill Road / The Packway junction – localised widening on The Packway arm of the roundabout.
- A3028 High Street / Orchard End – mini-roundabout layout to replace existing priority T-junction. Localised carriageway widening.
- A3028 High Street / Salisbury Road / Double Hedges junction – double mini-roundabout to replace existing priority staggered crossroads junction.
- A303(T) / A338 junction – localised widening of A303(T) connector road where it joins the A338 at a priority T-junction.
- A338 Park Road / Station Road junction – localised widening of A338 carriageway to south of junction to enable separate right turn lane and an ahead and left-turn lane on the A338 northbound and two ahead lanes on the A338 southbound.
- A338 Pennings Road / Mercut Road junction – replace existing priority T-junction with a signal controlled junction.

- A338 Pennings Road / A3026 Ludgershall Road junction – localised widening of A3026 arm of the junction.
- A3026 Tidworth Rd / A342 High Street / A342 Andover Road – improvements as set out in Drummond Park planning application.

9.46 The OTA concludes by stating the following:

“Subject to delivery of the identified junction improvement schemes, in conjunction with an effective strategy to reduce dependency upon the private car for journeys associated with the rebasing proposals, it is considered that the Masterplan proposals are therefore acceptable on transport grounds”.

9.47 The broad findings and conclusions of the OTA are accepted by the WC Highways Officer who considers them to be “.... a very helpful basis upon which to begin consideration of the likely transport impacts/implications and need for mitigation”. In principle the OTA demonstrates that the local highway infrastructure is capable of accommodating the ABP without detriment to highway safety and without introducing capacity issues which cannot be addressed by relatively minor junction alterations and/or by the implementation of a robust Travel Plan.

9.48 At the time of writing this report the final response from the Highways Agency is awaited following its request for additional information. The recommendation is drafted to reflect this.

9.49 Framework Travel Plan

The OTA is accompanied by a Framework Travel Plan (FTP). The FTP sets out site strategies and measures that will be introduced to influence modal choice with a view to reducing dependency upon the private car. The intention is to produce site specific Travel Plans at the planning application stage within the framework set out in the FTP. The individual Travel Plans may influence the degree to which improvements are required to the wider road network.

9.50 Impact on landscape

The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.

9.51 Policy CP51 of the eWCS relates specifically to landscape, requiring development to protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character, and not have a harmful impact upon landscape character. The policy requires new development to demonstrate that the following aspects of landscape character have been conserved or enhanced through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures:

- 1 *the locally distinctive pattern and species composition of natural features such as trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, watercourses and water bodies.*
- 2 *the locally distinctive character of settlements and their landscape settings.*

- 3 *the separate identity of settlements and the transition between man-made and natural landscapes at the urban fringe.*
- 4 *visually sensitive skylines, soils, geological and topographical features.*
- 5 *landscape features of cultural, historic and heritage value.*
- 6 *important views and visual amenity.*
- 7 *tranquillity and the need to protect against intrusion from light pollution, noise, and motion.*
- 8 *landscape functions including places to live, work, relax and recreate.*
- 9 *special qualities of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and the New Forest National Park, where great weight will be afforded to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty.*

9.52 Policy CP59 of the eWCS relates specifically to the WHS and is set out in the heritage section of this report.

9.53 As is evident, there is one international landscape designation partially within the SPTA, namely Stonehenge WHS. At the national level the North Wessex Downs AONB is adjacent to Salisbury Plain to the north-east. There are four Registered Parks and Gardens relatively close. In relation to local designations, much of Salisbury Plain and surrounding areas lie within Special Landscape Areas (SLA's). The purpose of SLA's is:

- To safeguard areas of special landscape quality from potentially damaging change;
- To ensure that distinctive local character is conserved and enhanced;
- To protect the landscape setting of settlements, prevent urban sprawl and protect important green space; and,
- To guide development in the countryside.

9.54 The OEA assesses the affects of ABP on the landscape at a level of detail appropriate to a master plan. It summarises its findings as follows:

“It is anticipated that following mitigation there would potentially be some residual significant landscape and visual effects as a result of the Salisbury Plain ABP. These potentially significant effects are related to the proposed SFA developments at Bulford, and Larkhill. There are no significant landscape or visual effects predicted for development related to military training infrastructure, and no residual significant landscape or visual effects predicted for all garrison development, or SFA development at the recommended Bulford SFA north site or the recommended Perham Down SFA site”.

The specific significant effects are defined as follows:

“Bulford -

Significant landscape effects of Bulford SFA South-West Site

There would be a significant adverse effect on the landscape of the site due to the intensive change in characteristics from arable land to a built-up area. Although mitigation is proposed to limit the impact, the change from open space to a built-up area cannot be entirely mitigated.

Significant visual effects of Bulford SFA South-West Site

Development would alter the rural views currently experienced from the footpath along the southern boundary of the site; this would be a significant adverse visual effect. The proposed mitigation would limit the impact by partially screening the site; however this would only be effective in the long-term.

Larkhill -

Visual effects on Stonehenge

At this stage it is not precisely known how the proposed development within Areas 4 and 11 would relate to and integrate with the existing built development visible from Stonehenge. However, it is not anticipated there would be any significant visual effects. The degree of visibility from Stonehenge should be assessed once development proposals have been finalised, and further studies could include the production of ZVIs, verified wirelines, and photomontages.

Significant landscape effects of Larkhill SFA Site

There would be a significant adverse effect on the landscape due to the loss of the distinctive qualities of the site, and the intensive change in characteristics from a greenfield site to a built up area. The proposed mitigation would assist in integrating the site into the landscape; however it would be years before this is effective.

Significant visual effects of Larkhill SFA Site

There would be significant adverse visual effects on users of public byways to the north and on the western boundary of the site. This is due to the loss of open views onto a rural landscape being replaced by views of a built-up area. The proposed mitigation would limit these visual effects in the long term; however it would be years before this is effective”.

9.55 The Master Plan has evolved as a consequence of the OEA, with certain sites excluded from the ABP. That said, there remain sites in the Plan to the east of Larkhill and to the south-west of Bulford where landscape impacts are inevitable. It is necessary to balance these impacts against the requirements of the ABP (specifically the SFA elements) to be located close to the camps where the occupying personnel

will be based. It is considered that, on balance, and as a matter of principle, the requirement outweighs the impacts, particularly when other considerations including sustainability and infrastructure provision are factored in. In summing up the WC Landscape Officer states the following:

“... At this stage the study is very high level; it is possible that as the master plan refines, good design principles and a well developed mitigation strategy could further reduce the significance of effects at both [Bulford and Larkhill] sites. However with such a substantial change in landscape character at these sites, the question is whether an acceptable level of change can be agreed by those with an interest in the area or look for a new location”.

9.56 With specific reference to the WHS, the OEA states that “... it is not anticipated there would be any significant visual effects”. It qualifies this by stating that the degree of visibility from Stonehenge will have to be further assessed once development proposals have been finalised. This is reasonable in the context of a master plan. This also explains English Heritage’s reserved judgement on the final impact of the Larkhill SFA on the WHS previously referred to. This is reflected in the recommendation.

9.57 Impact on local services

Policy CP3 of the eWCS states that *all new development will be required to provide for the necessary on-site and off-site infrastructure requirements arising from development*. It further states that infrastructure requirements will be delivered directly by the developer and/or through an appropriate financial contribution prior to, or in conjunction with, the development.

9.58 Social infrastructure includes schools, health care facilities, recreation facilities and open space, and other community facilities such as village halls. The impact of the ABP on these is considered below.

9.59 Education

The Master Plan sets out MOD data by year for the net incoming child population resulting from ABP. The table is reproduced here:

| Year | Children | | | | |
|-------|------------|---------|-----------|----------------------|-------|
| | Pre-school | Primary | Secondary | 6 th Form | Total |
| 2014 | -36 | +126 | +41 | +27 | +158 |
| 2015 | -169 | -155 | -97 | -21 | -442 |
| 2016 | +16 | +94 | +46 | +8 | +164 |
| 2017+ | +867 | +942 | +403 | +43 | +2255 |
| Total | +678 | +1007 | +393 | +57 | +2134 |

9.60 The Master Plan acknowledges that there are issues in terms of education capacity in certain locations. It, therefore, indicates provision of new schools on the plans. These are, at primary level, a new two-form entry school at Larkhill (to address capacity issues stemming from the incoming child population in this area and to accommodate the relocation of Figheldean Primary School), and a new two form entry school at Ludgershall. There are also requirements for improvements and enlargements of other primary schools. At secondary level the Master Plan states that a further in-depth study of potential capacity for new school places will be undertaken in order to assess the investment in supporting infrastructure required in association with the SFA. This will consider future proofing secondary education facilities and the feasibility of the MOD providing additional land in the Tidworth area to accommodate further secondary age provision with associated playing fields.

9.61 The Master Plan's recognition that ABP will impact on education provision is supported by WC Education. The locations in the Plan indicated for new primary schools are also supported in principle. However, this support is subject to mechanisms being offered and agreed to ensure actual delivery of the facilities by DIO in accordance with Policy CP3. In this regard the Master Plan states the following:

“The delivery of some of the infrastructure, such as schools and non-military health facilities, will be the responsibility of others but DIO will be providing its support and assistance in line with the on-going partnering relationship with Wiltshire Council and the military and civilian partnerships that have been operating for many years. The provision of additional central government funding for new community facilities is the subject of ongoing discussion”.

The recommendation has been drafted in recognition that discussions relating to delivery mechanisms for social infrastructure made necessary by ABP are “ongoing”.

9.62 Public health

The Master Plan acknowledges that ABP is likely to generate the need for additional GP services and dental care services. Quantitatively, it is estimated that this demand will be for an additional 1.5 GP's and 1.64 dentists across the board.

9.63 These estimates are accepted by WC Public Health, although as with the education requirements, discussions relating to necessary mechanisms being offered and agreed to ensure actual delivery of the services by DIO are ongoing. Again, the recommendation is drafted with regard to this.

9.64 Recreation facilities and open space, and other community facilities

Core Strategy policies set out standards for provision of on- and off-site open space and recreation facilities, and other community facilities. The detailed design (of SFA in particular) will have to have regard to these. Such detail is a matter for planning applications rather than the Master Plan.

9.65 Impact on Employment

The Masterplan acknowledges that an increase in the county's population resulting from ABP will result in an increase in demand for jobs, in particular from partners of military personnel living in SFA. The Master Plan states the following:

“DIO will work with Wiltshire Council to identify opportunities to support the ‘Strategic Economic Plan’ (SEP) initiatives by the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Opportunities could include creating new employment space, and MoD providing land to facilitate incubation (start-up) facilities and small enterprises. An example of existing development is the Castledown Business Centre at Ludgershall and Wiltshire Council have aspirations for a similar development in the Larkhill area.

The Swindon & Wiltshire City Deal aims to improve the skills of local workforce and identify where appropriate economic growth can develop, including on redundant military sites. The SEP will investigate unlocking the economic potential of areas with military presence by utilising the skills of military personnel, and a large number of the incoming spouses, to support business growth and by bringing military sites that have been declared surplus into use”.

9.66 Impact on utilities

Key consultees have confirmed to DIO's utilities provider that there should not be issues of principle arising from additional demands for gas and electricity.

9.67 Regarding foul water discharge Wessex Water has stated that there is capacity at Ratfyn STW for development at Bulford and Larkhill, although additional filters would be required at Amesbury SWT. Discussions are ongoing with Veolia in relation to capacity at Ludgershall/Tidworth.

9.68 Wessex Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity for water supply, although subject to Veolia's continued bulk supply to Ludgershall and Tidworth.

10. Infrastructure delivery and cumulative impacts

10.1 Specific demands upon infrastructure resulting from development taking place (such as education, local services and transport) is considered in section 9 above. Nevertheless, it warrants further clarification that the Masterplan allows for the totality of development associated with the ABP to be considered as well as an assessment of the infrastructure necessary to support that development taking place.

10.2 In accordance with the tests set out in the NPPF, the ABP will be expected to deliver all infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In this regard the Master Plan reinforces a commitment of the DIO to partner Wiltshire Council to deliver wider community facilities that would naturally follow from development taking place. The precise mechanism (for example, obligations via s106 of The Act or via the CIL Regulations) for delivery of such infrastructure will be a

matter for negotiation at the time of the submission and consideration of individual planning applications.

- 10.3 As previously stated, to inform the choice of location for development, the Master Plan is supported by the OEA. However, the planning applications may individually require Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), particularly where there is likely to be 'in combination' effects not yet addressed by the OEA. As part of the EIA process, it can be expected that the work of the OEA would be built upon, with the cumulative impacts of development on a range of environmental, social and economic factors being considered in more detail.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The purpose of the Army Basing Programme Master Plan is to establish the constraints and opportunities for new development in and around the SPTA, and to provide an overview of where development can take place. It is informed by a number of 'high level' reports and studies as well as both technical and 'grass roots' consultation responses which have influenced its evolution. The Master Plan largely demonstrates that, as a matter of principle, the ABP can be accommodated without detriment or with appropriate mitigation. This is subject to a limited list of outstanding matters being addressed.
- 11.2 The master planning process provides a holistic approach to assessing the totality of development across the SPTA and has, therefore, enabled the consideration of the cumulative impacts associated with the ABP. In addition, it has also allowed early realisation of the infrastructure requirements made necessary by ABP.
- 11.3 Individual planning applications will still be necessary before development can take place. Where necessary, those planning applications will be brought before the Strategic Planning Committee for consideration. Beyond the principle of development endorsement of the ABP Masterplan in no way fetters the Council's consideration of those planning applications.
- 11.4 The recommendation to the Strategic Committee is to, therefore, endorse the Master Plan as a material consideration to be taken into account in the consideration of all future planning applications relating to the ABP, this subject to the outstanding matters being addressed to the satisfaction of the technical consultees.

12. Legal Implications

- 12.1 The Army Basing Programme is a large scale major development which by its nature has wider strategic implications and raises issues of more than local importance. The Salisbury Plain Training Area straddles two or more Area Committees and therefore it is appropriate that this development is considered by the Strategic Planning Committee pursuant to paragraph 2.1 of Part 3 of the Wiltshire Council Constitution notwithstanding that the development may be progressed by a series of phased applications.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Strategic Planning Committee both notes and endorses the Army Basing Programme Master Plan as a material consideration to be taken into account in the consideration of subsequent planning applications.

This is subject to the following matters of principle being addressed to the satisfaction of the Associate Director for Economic Development and Planning:

- **The outstanding issue relating to the impact of additional water abstraction arising from ABP being addressed, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England;**
- **The outstanding issue relating to the impact of foul water discharge from ABP on phosphate levels in the River Avon being addressed, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England;**
- **The outstanding issue relating to the potential impact of increased recreational pressure on Salisbury Plain from ABP on protected species being addressed, in consultation with Natural England;**

And the following site specific matters of principle or detail being addressed to the satisfaction of the Associate Director for Economic Development and Planning as part of the planning application process:

- **The outstanding issue relating to the potential need to provide additional STW capacity from ABP at Larkhill being addressed, in consultation with English Heritage;**
- **The outstanding issue relating to the potential impact of the Larkhill SFA on the setting of Stonehenge and the WHS being addressed, in consultation with English Heritage;**
- **The outstanding issue relating to unknown underground archaeology being addressed;**
- **The outstanding issues relating to the design of the mechanisms required to ensure delivery of essential infrastructure made necessary by ABP being addressed;**

And subject to the following:

- **The Highways Agency raising no in principle objection;
Veolia raising no in principle objection to water supply and foul water processing capacity issues at Tidworth and Ludgershall.**

Andrew Guest, Area Development Manager (South)

Background papers:

ABP Master Plan
ABP Overarching Environmental Assessment (and non-technical summary)
ABP Planning Context Report
ABP Outline Transport Assessment
ABP Framework Travel Plan
ABP Statement of Community Involvement

Appendix 1: ABP Master Plan
Appendix 2: SCI summary list of third party consultation responses
Appendix 3: DIO response to comments by EA, NE & WC Ecologist
Appendix 4: Summary of responses from statutory consultees & other stakeholders
Appendix 5: Abbreviations

Important background reports to the Army Basing Programme Master Plan referred to in this report can be viewed in electronic form at the following address:

<https://n3g.4projects.com/document/publicfiles.aspx?DocumentID=d19c261e-a6d5-49a3-b7cd-361500565908#>