



Working towards a Core Strategy for Wiltshire

Sustainability Appraisal/  
Strategic Environmental  
Assessment

Sustainability Appraisal Report  
Appendix H

Wiltshire Core Strategy  
Prepared for Council June 2012



## Appendix H - Core Strategy policies: appraisal of likely significant effects

### Core policy 1: The settlement strategy

#### Core policy 1 (part 1): Settlement strategy

Core Policy 1 (part 1): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	+/?	-/?	Options 1 and 3 do not provide certainty on smaller settlements role and function which could cause development pressure in rural locations. They may lead to inappropriate development at unsuitable locations.	Development should be promoted in appropriate locations where adverse effects are minimised. Development should avoid damage to designated sites, ancient woodland, disturbance of protected/notable species and lead to an enhancement of current assets.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	0	-/?	All options likely to result in some Greenfield development. Option B most favourable as it would direct development to more sustainable locations.	Development should encourage development of brownfield sites that are well located to their settlement and that have good access to public transport, services and facilities.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	It is not possible to predict effects at this stage. Effects will depend on the location and type of any development proposed, and proposals for waste infrastructure etc.	None. Separate sustainability appraisal work has been carried out on strategic sites within settlements.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	?	-/?	Effects will depend on the location and type of any development proposed, proximity to watercourses etc. and any protection designations. Options 1 and 3 may lead to development in inappropriate locations which may pose more risk to water resources.	Development would need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	+	-/?	Effects will depend on the location and	Any housing and employment development

Core Policy 1 (part 1): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									type of any development proposed. Options 1 and 3 may lead to development in inappropriate locations which may pose more risk to water resources. Option 2 likely to steer development to more sustainable locations that can better mitigate flood risk.	should avoid areas of flood risk. Consideration of SuDS, where appropriate but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas and appropriate adaptation measures must be employed.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	-/?	0	-/?	Development in any location likely to increase impacts associated with air quality, noise, light pollution etc. Significance will depend on location and type of development. Some settlements would be inappropriate for large scale growth as would exacerbate private car use. Option 2 likely to steer development to more sustainable locations that can better mitigate effects.	Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use, with improved public transport services, walking and cycling routes linking with the town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Policy promotes growth. Any development likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions. Significance will depend on location, type of development and mitigation measures employed.	Mitigation measures through energy efficiency, use of renewable and low/zero carbon energy sources and investment in sustainable transport solutions.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Development in any location likely to impact on heritage assets. Significance will depend on location, type of development and mitigation measures employed.	Careful consideration of design standards is required to avoid adverse impacts in any location. Development should be in keeping with existing urban form and respect the character of the area. Archaeological survey work may be required for all

Core Policy 1 (part 1): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										potential sites.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	-/?	Option 2 would offer greater protection to smaller settlements where development may be inappropriate. This will have benefits for local landscape character. Options 1 and 2 offer less protection.	Policy should only promote development in locations which are appropriate from a landscape perspective. Development should not adversely impact areas of high landscape value.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Options 1 and 3	LT	R	B	L	++/?	+/?	++/?	Options 1 and 3 less restrictive. Will allow housing in many more locations. Option 2 more restrictive and may reduce opportunities in some smaller settlements.	To maximise benefits, housing should be provided in settlements where there is a recognised need and affordable homes provided to increase affordability across Wiltshire.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-?	+/?	Policy proposes housing and employment so could provide benefits for health and wellbeing. Option 2 more restrictive and may not allow growth in settlements that want it to increase self-containment and improve viability of businesses such as village stores.	Development should be promoted where it is needed and appropriate. Provision of housing and jobs can allow health benefits but only where it is appropriate.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-?	+/?	Few impacts envisaged. Option 2 more restrictive. May reduce self-containment and quality of life opportunities in some settlements.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-?	+/?	Option 2 could restrict growth in smaller communities and therefore provision of community services/facilities.	None
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	-/?	0	Option 2 may reduce employment opportunities in some rural areas	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide local employment opportunities.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged	None
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-?	+/?	Option 2 more restrictive. May harm local economy and employment	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide

Core Policy 1 (part 1): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									opportunities in some areas.	local employment opportunities.
17. Employment	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-/?	+/?	Option 2 more restrictive. May harm local economy and employment opportunities in some areas.	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide local employment opportunities.

### Core policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy – settlement boundaries

Core Policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 would be likely to lead to additional development which could adversely impact biodiversity. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development and proximity to sensitive areas. Option 1 neutral effect.	Any relaxation or amendment of boundaries should not lead to inappropriate development that would adversely impact on biodiversity.
2. Land and soil	Yes Option 3	LT	I	A	L	+/?	-/?	--/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development on Greenfield sites. Option 3 may be significant with removal of all settlement boundaries. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development, and value of agricultural land.	Any relaxation or amendment of boundaries should not lead to inappropriate development that would lead to loss of significant areas of Greenfield land or high value agricultural land.
3. Waste management	No	/	/	/		0	0	0	No impacts envisaged at this stage. Option 1 neutral effect.	None.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development which could adversely impact water resources.	Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to water resources including any designated areas eg

Core Policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									Effects would depend on location, type and size of development. Option 1 neutral effect.	groundwater source protection zones, river SACs etc.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development which could increase flood risk. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development. Option 1 neutral effect.	Development should avoid areas of flood risk. Consideration of SuDS, where appropriate, but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas and appropriate adaptation measures must be employed.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development which could adversely impact on air quality and other forms of pollution. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development. Option 1 neutral effect.	Development should be located where impacts on air quality and amenity can be avoided or minimised. Consideration of schemes to minimise private car use, with improved public transport services, walking and cycling routes linking with the town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development which could increase impacts on climate change. Option 1 neutral effect.	Development should be located where climate impacts can be avoided or minimised, and where adaptation measures can be incorporated.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	-/?	Options 2 and 3 may lead to some additional development which could increase impacts on heritage assets. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development. Option 1 neutral effect.	Development should be located where adverse impacts on heritage assets can be avoided or minimised. Removing settlement boundaries unlikely to achieve this.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	C	L	0	-/?	-/?	Option 3 could lead to significant landscape impacts if all boundaries removed, with development occurring in	Development should be located where adverse impacts on rural and urban landscapes can be avoided or minimised.

Core Policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									inappropriate locations. Options 1 & 2 may offer greater landscape protection. Effects would depend on location, type and size of development.	Removing settlement boundaries unlikely to achieve this.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Options 1 & 3.	MT	R	C	L	--/?	+/?	++/?	Option 1 likely to significantly restrict housing provision by retaining all existing boundaries. Current settlement boundaries are not fit for purpose as the boundaries were created through an arbitrary planning process with little community consultation. This has created a shortfall in housing and new employment, especially in the rural areas, through overly restrictive boundaries excluding areas of developable land. Applications that have been approved by the authority and by appeal bear testament to this situation and current boundaries are likely to continue to restrict housing and employment development impacting on the economy. Option 2 and 3 would increase housing provision. For Option 3 removal may significantly increase housing provision (but at the expense of other objectives).	To maximise benefits, housing should be provided in settlements where there is a recognised need and affordable homes provided to increase affordability across Wiltshire. This should be achieved through consultation with local communities to establish what the local need is.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+/?	+/?	Few impacts envisaged. Options 2 and 3 would allow more housing and employment land to be made available which could have benefits for health and wellbeing.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+/?	-/?	Reviewing existing boundaries (option 2)	None.



Core Policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
deprivation									will allow settlements to grow in an appropriate way. This will increase housing and job opportunities and improve viability of local businesses. Option 3 would lead to inappropriate development. Option 1 neutral effect.	
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+/?	+/?	Options 2 and 3 could both improve viability and provision of community services/facilities by making land available for housing and employment.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+/?	+/?	Options 2 and 3 would make land available for housing and employment growth. This would help retain and attract skilled workers for local businesses.	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide local employment opportunities.
15. Transport	Yes Option 3.	MT	R	A	L	0	-/?	--/?	Neutral effects Option 1. Option 2 may increase car use with some additional development. Option 3 may allow development in many less sustainable locations and lead to an increase in need to travel by all forms.	Policy should promote development in locations with good public transport connectivity or where this could be achieved. Also, locations that improve self-containment of settlements to reduce need to travel.
16. Economy	Yes Option 2.	LT	R	B	L	-	++/?	+/?	Option 1 – retaining all boundaries could adversely the economy, particularly in rural areas, not allowing villages to grow sustainably. Option 2 could significantly benefit rural economies through identification of land for housing/employment in sustainable locations that do not adversely affect other objectives. Option 3 – benefits but possible adverse effects on other, particularly environmental, objectives	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide local employment and housing opportunities. Provision of affordable housing is important. There should be a review of existing boundaries but not removal.

Core Policy 1 (part 2): The settlement strategy Options 1-3 (see section 5.3 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									that could reduce environmental quality and tourism opportunities in rural areas. Extent of effects dependent on location, size and type of development concerned.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Options 1 and 2.	LT	R	B	L	--	++/?	+/?	Option 1 will restrict employment opportunities in rural areas. Option 2 could significantly benefit rural economies through identification of land for housing/employment in sustainable locations that do not adversely affect other objectives. Option 3 – benefits but possible adverse effects on other, particularly environmental, objectives that could reduce environmental quality and tourism opportunities. Extent of effects dependent on location, size and type of development concerned.	Policy should not restrict development where it may be appropriate and provide local employment and housing opportunities. Provision of affordable housing is important. There should be a review of existing boundaries but not removal.

### Core Policy 2: Delivery strategy – employment land provision

Core Policy 2: Employment land provision Option 1: 36 ha    Option 2: 178 ha    Option 3: 213 ha										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes. Options 2 and 3.	LT	R	B	L	-	--	--	Option 1 – less development. Consequent limited effects on biodiversity. Options 2 & 3 – significant effects due to	Prioritise brownfield sites. A lower level of employment development would reduce effects. Areas of particular

Core Policy 2: Employment land provision										
Option 1: 36 ha	Option 2: 178 ha		Option 3: 213 ha							
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									higher level of Greenfield land required.	ecological sensitivity and proximity should be avoided for development.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes. Options 2 and 3.	LT	I	C	L	-	--	--	Options 2 & 3 will require significant area of Greenfield land for development of which some may be higher grade agricultural land. Development also likely to occur away from more sustainable town centre locations.	Prioritise brownfield sites. A lower level of employment development would reduce effects. Lower quality agricultural land should be prioritised for development where appropriate taking into account other sustainability considerations.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes. Options 2 and 3.	MT	R	C	L	-	-	--	Higher level of employment provision likely to have more significant effects on waste management through construction and operational stages. Depends on final employment uses.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	-	-	Some increase in water use likely through higher provision but not considered significant unless industrial uses that require high volumes of water.	Most employment provision likely to be service industries.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	--	Will depend on location but higher provision likely to need more Greenfield land, increasing surface water runoff and possibility of flood plain encroachment.	Preference for brownfield sites. Avoidance of FZ 2 and 3 with appropriate use of SuDS.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes. Options 2 and 3.					-	--	--	Level of provision proposed through options 2 & 3 likely to significantly increase emissions to air and other forms of pollution through construction and operational stages, loss of tranquillity and transport.	Reduced effects through locating development in more sustainable locations that reduce need to travel, can take advantage of sustainable transport and reduced operational emissions.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes. Options 2 and 3.	LT	?	B	L	-	--	--	Significant effects likely through construction and operation of sites and transport impacts. Also loss of Greenfield sites that can act as climate change mitigation and adaptation.	Reduced effects through locating development in more sustainable locations that reduce need to travel, can take advantage of sustainable

Core Policy 2: Employment land provision										
Option 1: 36 ha	Option 2: 178 ha		Option 3: 213 ha							
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										transport and reduced operational emissions.
8. Historic environment	No	MT	R	A	L	?	-	-	Very dependent on where development takes place. Likely that higher development scenarios will have greater effect on the historic environment, especially archaeological interests.	Further information required on location of any development to give more accurate assessment. Appropriate archaeological assessment should always be considered, as well as high quality design that is sensitive to the local area.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	Yes. Options 2 and 3.	LT	R	C	L	-	--	--	Higher development scenarios likely to have significant effect on areas of landscape importance especially re AONB. Again very much dependent on location and type of industry.	In proximity to AONB, particular consideration of location, type of industry, design and landscaping.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+	Options 2 and 3 likely to help stimulate housing development through better access to jobs.	
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	B	L	-	+	+	Direct link between a healthy economy and healthy communities. Greater employment provision likely to have benefits for health and wellbeing.	Location of development should enable people to access jobs through sustainable transport modes and jobs should be appropriate to local skills without increasing in-commuting.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	C	L	-	+	++	Benefits through job creation. More significant through greater provision.	
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	C	L	0	+	+	Greater employment provision will attract people to Wiltshire and increase viability of community facilities across the county.	
14. Education	Yes options 2 and	LT	R	B	L	-	++	++	Greater employment provision will	

Core Policy 2: Employment land provision										
Option 1: 36 ha	Option 2: 178 ha		Option 3: 213 ha							
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
and skills	3.								significantly increase opportunities for training, skills retention and apprenticeships and attract inward investment to Wiltshire.	
15. Transport	Yes option 1.	MT	R	B	L	--/?	-/?	-/?	Option 1 very unlikely to meet Wiltshire's needs with subsequent increases in out-commuting. Options 2 and 3 more likely to meet needs but will increase transport impacts across the county.	Development should be located where transport impacts are minimised, where there is good access to sustainable transport modes and town/city centres. Good access to the strategic highway network is important but is unlikely to increase sustainable mode usage.
16. Economy	Yes options 2 and 3.	LT	R	B	L	--	++	++	Option 1 unlikely to meet employment needs of local economy. Options 2 and 3 very likely to meet this need. Significant economic benefits. Greater benefits through option 3 if businesses take advantage in current economic climate.	Important to make provision for correct level of need. Too much provision may reduce land available for housing development. Too little provision will damage economy and may increase out-commuting.
17. Employment	Yes options 2 and 3.	LT	R	B	L	--	++	++	Option 1 unlikely to meet employment needs of local economy. Options 2 and 3 very likely to meet this need. Significant economic benefits.	

### Core Policy 2: Delivery strategy – new housing requirements

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures	
		T	R	S	L				
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	?	C	L	-	Likely that much housing would be	Housing provision towards the lower end of	

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							provided on greenfield sites. Provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce impacts. Provision towards the higher end of the range may increase likelihood of direct/indirect and cumulative impacts on habitats and designated areas.	the range would be most beneficial in reducing any impacts, as this would require less development of Greenfield land, and fewer disturbances to biodiversity assets. Provision of higher level of housing may allow increased provision of Green Infrastructure which could result in greater benefits overall.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes	LT	I	C	L	--	This objective is concerned with effective and efficient use of land. Any level of housing within this range is likely to require a significant area of Greenfield land, due to lack of brownfield opportunities in Wiltshire.	Opportunities for development on brownfield sites are few in Wiltshire due to the rural nature of the county. Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce loss of Greenfield land and B & MV agricultural land. Building at higher densities would also reduce any loss. Development should try to avoid loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3a B&MV agricultural land if possible.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT/ LT	R	C	L	-	This level of housing likely to significantly increase amounts of construction and household waste. However, increases in recycling and improvements in recycling rates likely to mitigate much of these impacts. Sustainability score could be improved if further information available on waste reduction/recycling initiatives associated	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would lead to a smaller increase in amounts of waste.

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							with any development.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	This level of housing likely to significantly increase demand for water from household use, even if strong measures in place to reduce water use. Sustainability score could be improved if further information available on measures to reduce water use. Development in any location can lead to impacts on water quality if appropriate mitigation measures not put in place.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would lead to a lesser increase in demand for water. Strong measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use should be incorporated in all future development. Location of development to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	Development on this scale, especially on Greenfield land, will increase surface water run-off unless appropriate mitigation measures. Performance against this objective very dependent on development location and further information required.	Development should take place in locations that are not subject to flood risk and Surface Water Management Strategies may be required to demonstrate equivalent to Greenfield runoff post development.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	Development on this scale likely to reduce air quality, particularly in town centres, as a result of increased car use associated with development. Development also likely to increase noise and light pollution, particularly where development takes place in edge-of-town locations that are currently rural in nature.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce impacts. However, providing a higher level of housing, particularly in the larger towns, may increase self-containment, make public transport services more efficient and frequent and reduce out-commuting (if associated with jobs).
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes	LT	I?	B	L	--	Housing provision on this scale likely to significantly increase emissions that can cause climate change, mainly through	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce impacts through reduced energy use and associated travel.

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							energy use in the home and associated travel.	All future housing development would need to incorporate significant energy efficiency measures in the home to reduce emissions, with low/zero carbon technologies, renewable forms of energy on and/or offsite, and consideration of CHP and district heating schemes. Mixed-use development and significant investment in sustainable transport modes will reduce car use.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	-/?	Wiltshire contains many areas of historic and archaeological importance. Possibility of direct and indirect adverse effects but depends on location. Concentrating development in the larger towns likely to affect local designations eg conservation areas, more than national/international designations.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce impacts on the historic environment. Less likelihood of direct/indirect impacts.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	I	B	L	-/?	Approximately 44% of Wiltshire is within an AONB. A small area is within New Forest National Park boundary and there are other local landscape designations. Potential for adverse impacts but dependent on location and design considerations, as well as housing numbers. It is likely that impacts on the landscape will be greater at higher levels of housing provision.	Large scale housing development should not be located in areas with specific landscape designations eg AONB, SLA. Housing located within such areas should maintain and enhance landscape character.



Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	The range of housing proposed strongly supports the provision of a wide range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community, including provision of affordable housing.	Increasing delivery may have a positive impact on housing affordability in Wiltshire, and should increase levels of affordable housing provision. Provision at the lower end of the range may not improve affordability significantly. Consideration should be given, in particular, to affordability issues in rural areas.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+/?	Positive impacts are likely if a wide range of factors are considered that will improve quality of life among new and existing residents. It is possible that development on this scale could place a strain on existing health services if adequate new facilities are not provided.	Design and layout of new development will play a significant part in improving quality of life for all residents, including reducing crime and the fear of crime and allowing more healthy lifestyles.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/?	Increased provision of affordable housing will reduce difficulties in accessing the housing market. Self-containment of places may also result if housing provision helps create new jobs and allows people to work locally rather than commuting to other areas.	Housing provision towards the higher end of the range would help improve affordability in Wiltshire.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+/?	New housing development can allow significant investment in new and existing community facilities through developer contributions and S.106 agreements. Possible that significant new housing	Appropriate investment should be made to improve key local facilities, including healthcare, education, retail and leisure, and provide new facilities, where necessary. Sufficient contributions should be sought or

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							could place a strain on existing services and facilities if insufficient investment made.	facilities provided on site.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	Additional housing will provide for a working age population that will attract employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). Skilled workers may be attracted to Wiltshire if new, family housing is provided. The construction industry is also a key employment sector that will be supported by the delivery of housing.	There should be adequate investment in educational facilities to cope with an increased population. Also, adequate provision of family housing should be considered to attract skilled workers to the area to support the local economy.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	This level of housing provision is likely to increase the need to travel. Even with greater investment in public transport, majority of journeys likely to be by private car. Effects dependent on location of housing, density, extent of mixed-use and level of investment in sustainable transport options.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would lessen increases in the need to travel. However, any provision within this range will significantly increase travel by private car, unless significant investment made in sustainable transport modes.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	Increasing levels of housing provision can support the economy by providing a working age population that may attract employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). The construction industry will be supported by housing delivery and a greater population, with corresponding	It is vital that housing delivery is supported by a corresponding increase in employment opportunities, supporting the local economy and helping to reduce out-commuting (a key issue in Wiltshire). Housing provision should support the viability and vitality of town centres. Housing development, in all locations, should

Core policy 2: Housing provision in the range of 35,800 to 42,100 (Option 1) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							increase in disposable income in the area, will support the local economy and viability of town centres.	be supported by strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by private car.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	Housing provision at the higher end of the scale would provide a significant new workforce with a range of skills that would satisfy future employment growth in Wiltshire, help retain businesses and attract new ones.	It is vital that housing delivery is supported by a corresponding increase in employment opportunities, supporting the local economy and helping to reduce out-commuting (a key issue in Wiltshire). Housing delivery without investment in job creation will increase unsustainable out-commuting to places such as Swindon, Bath and Bristol. Housing provision should support the viability and vitality of town centres. Mixed-use development which offers opportunities for people to work locally will be important and will reduce the need to travel.

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes	MT	R	C	L	--	Likely that much housing would be provided on greenfield sites and this level of provision would increase likelihood of direct/indirect and cumulative impacts on habitats and designated areas.	Avoidance of development in proximity to designated areas and ecologically important brownfield sites. Biodiversity enhancement wherever possible.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes	LT	I	C	L	--	Significant loss of Greenfield land and	Opportunities for development on brownfield

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							higher grade agricultural land likely through this level of housing provision.	sites are few in Wiltshire due to the rural nature of the county. Building at higher densities would reduce loss and avoidance of Grades 1, 2 or 3a B&MV agricultural land where possible.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes	MT/LT	R	B	L	--	This level of housing likely to significantly increase amounts of construction and household waste.	Use of Site Waste Management Plans and dwellings should meet high CSH standards for construction and other forms of waste.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	This level of housing likely to significantly increase demand for water from household use and may increase impacts on rivers directly and through increased abstraction.	Strong measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use should be incorporated in all future development. Location of development to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	Development on this scale, especially on Greenfield land, will increase surface water run-off unless appropriate mitigation measures. This higher level of housing will still be able to avoid areas of flood risk so not considered significant.	Development should take place in locations that are not susceptible to flood risk and Surface Water Management Strategies may be required to demonstrate equivalent to Greenfield runoff post development.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	Development on this scale likely to significantly reduce air quality, particularly in town centres, as a result of increased car use associated with development. Development also likely to increase noise and light pollution, particularly where development takes place in edge-of-town	Mitigation measures include making significant improvements to sustainable transport modes to reduce car use and reducing effects on amenity through high quality design.

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							locations that are currently rural in nature.	
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes	LT	I?	B	L	--	Housing provision on this scale likely to significantly increase emissions that can cause climate change, mainly through energy use in the home and associated travel.	All future housing development would need to incorporate significant energy efficiency measures in the home to reduce emissions, with low/zero carbon technologies, renewable forms of energy on and/or offsite, and consideration of CHP and district heating schemes. Mixed-use development and significant investment in sustainable transport modes will reduce car use.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	I?	C	L	-/?	Wiltshire contains many areas of historic and archaeological importance. Possibility of direct and indirect adverse effects but depends on location.	Appropriate archaeological assessment should always be considered, as well as high quality design that is sensitive to the local area.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes	LT	I	B	L	--/?	Approx 44% of Wiltshire is within an AONB and there are other local landscape designations. Likely that impacts on the landscape will be greater at higher levels of housing provision.	Large scale housing development should not be located in areas with specific landscape designations eg AONB, SLA. Housing located within such areas should maintain and enhance landscape character. Detailed landscape assessment may be required to assess impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	The range of housing proposed strongly supports the provision of a wide range of house types and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community, including provision of affordable housing.	Increasing delivery will have a positive impact on housing affordability in Wiltshire, and should increase levels of affordable housing provision. Consideration should be given, in particular, to affordability issues in rural areas. Housing should also be located in sustainable

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
								locations that allow easy access to a range of local services and facilities.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	B	L	+/?	<p>Positive impacts are likely if a wide range of factors are considered that will improve quality of life among new and existing residents.</p> <p>It is possible that development on this scale could place a strain on existing health services if adequate new facilities are not provided.</p> <p>Benefits overall.</p>	Design and layout of new development will play a significant part in improving quality of life for all residents, including reducing crime and the fear of crime and allowing more healthy lifestyles. High quality design can reduce many amenity issues. Development should incorporate high quality, accessible healthcare facilities, recreational opportunities and contribute to a network of multifunctional Green Infrastructure.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/?	<p>Increased provision of affordable housing will reduce difficulties in accessing the housing market. Self-containment of places may also result if housing provision helps create new jobs and allows people to work locally rather than commuting to other areas.</p>	Housing provision towards the higher end of the range would help improve affordability in Wiltshire.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++/?	<p>New housing development can allow significant investment in new and existing community facilities through developer contributions and S.106 agreements.</p> <p>Possible that significant new housing could place a strain on existing services and facilities if insufficient investment made.</p>	Appropriate investment should be made to improve key local facilities, including healthcare, education, retail and leisure, and provide new facilities, where necessary. Sufficient contributions should be sought or facilities provided on site.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	<p>Additional housing will provide for a working age population that will attract</p>	There should be adequate investment in educational facilities to cope with an

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). Skilled workers may be attracted to Wiltshire if new, family housing is provided. The construction industry is also a key employment sector that will be supported by the delivery of housing.	increased population. Also, adequate provision of family housing should be considered to attract skilled workers to the area to support the local economy.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	This level of housing provision is likely to significantly increase the need to travel. Even with greater investment in public transport, majority of journeys likely to be by private car.	This higher level of provision will significantly increase travel by private car, unless significant investment made in sustainable transport modes.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	High levels of housing provision will support the economy by providing a working age population that may attract employers to the area (or result in business start-ups). The construction industry will be supported by housing delivery and a greater population, with corresponding increase in disposable income in the area, will support the local economy and viability of town centres.	It is vital that housing delivery is supported by a corresponding increase in employment opportunities, supporting the local economy and helping to reduce out-commuting (a key issue in Wiltshire). Housing provision should support the viability and vitality of town centres. Where housing development takes place on the edge of town, new services and facilities, especially retail, should not compete with the existing town centre. Housing development, in all locations, should be supported by strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by private car.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	++	Housing provision at the higher end of the scale would provide significant new	It is vital that housing delivery is supported by a corresponding increase in employment

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 56,800 dwellings (Option 2) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							workforce with a range of skills that would satisfy future employment growth in Wiltshire, help retain businesses and attract inward investment.	opportunities, supporting the local economy and helping to reduce out-commuting (a key issue in Wiltshire). Housing provision should support the viability and vitality of town centres. Where housing development takes place on the edge of town, new services and facilities, especially retail, should not compete with the existing town centre. Mixed-use development which offers opportunities for people to work locally will be important and will reduce the need to travel.

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 20,900 dwellings (Option 3) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	-	Reduced impacts due to a much lower level of provision. Greater likelihood that development can avoid some of the more sensitive areas but adverse effects still likely overall.	Housing provision at a much lower level would be most beneficial in reducing any impacts, as this would require less development of Greenfield land, and fewer disturbances to biodiversity assets.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	-	Some loss of Greenfield land but on a much reduced scale compared with other options.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce loss of Greenfield land and B & MV agricultural land. Building at higher densities would also reduce any loss.



Core policy 2: Housing provision of 20,900 dwellings (Option 3) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
3. Waste management	No	MT/ LT	R	C	L	-	Inevitable increases in waste but at a much lower level with this reduced level of housing growth.	Use of Site Waste Management Plans and meeting high CSH standards for construction and other forms of waste.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	B	L	-	Water demand likely to increase with some impacts on water resources generally but at a much lower level with this reduced level of housing growth.	Strong measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use should be incorporated in all future development. Location of development to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
5. Flood risk	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	Development will increase surface water run-off generally. However, this much lower level of housing could avoid many of the impacts associated with a higher level of growth.	Development should take place in locations that are not susceptible to flood risk and Surface Water Management Strategies may be required to demonstrate equivalent to Greenfield runoff post development. Appropriate use of SuDS and other mitigation measures to reduce flood risk.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	B	L	-	This level of development likely to impact on air quality and add to other forms of environmental pollution but on a much reduced scale compared with other development scenarios.	Developing in sustainable locations that are in closer proximity to town centres can reduce impacts. This reduced level of growth would avoid much urban edge development that can increase effects.
7. Climatic factors	Yes	LT	I?	B	L	-	Increase in greenhouse gas emissions likely but at a much reduced level compared with other options.	All future housing development would need to incorporate significant energy efficiency measures in the home to reduce emissions, with low/zero carbon technologies, renewable forms of energy on and/or offsite, and consideration of CHP and district heating schemes. Mixed-use development and

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 20,900 dwellings (Option 3) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
								significant investment in sustainable transport modes will reduce car use.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	I?	C	L	-/?	Possibility of direct and indirect adverse effects but depends on location. Some adverse effects likely.	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would reduce impacts on the historic environment. Less likelihood of direct/indirect impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment should always be considered, as well as high quality design that is sensitive to the local area.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	I?	B	L	-/?	Potential for adverse impacts but dependent on location and design considerations. It is likely that impacts on the landscape will be reduced at lower levels of housing provision.	Large scale housing development should not be located in areas with specific landscape designations eg AONB, SLA. Housing located within such areas should maintain and enhance landscape character. Detailed landscape assessment may be required to assess impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	This level of provision will meet some of Wiltshire's needs but unlikely to meet all and will not improve affordability. If housing needs not met this will adversely affect the local economy and a number of other sustainability considerations.	To provide benefits against this particular objective a higher level of housing provision would need to be considered.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-	Housing provision unlikely to meet housing need. Unlikely to be able to fund appropriate social and economic infrastructure to meet community needs.	To provide benefits against this particular objective a higher level of housing provision would need to be considered.

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 20,900 dwellings (Option 3) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)								
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L			
							Lack of homes will result in increased affordability problems and lack of modern, decent accommodation.	
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-	Housing provision unlikely to meet housing need. Increased social exclusion as affordability problems worsen.	To provide benefits against this particular objective a higher level of housing provision would need to be considered.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No					0	Neutral effects envisaged. Fewer homes will place less strain on existing services and facilities but will be insufficient to fund appropriate levels of new social and economic infrastructure.	To provide benefits against this particular objective a higher level of housing provision would need to be considered.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	Adverse effects overall. Less pressure on existing educational facilities but this level of housing provision unlikely to provide workers to meet the needs of local businesses. This will damage the local economy.	To provide benefits against this particular objective a higher level of housing provision would need to be considered.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	This level of housing provision will increase the need to travel overall but not significant compared with other options. There may also be the effect of reducing self-containment; it will not provide for the anticipated future level of jobs which may lead to in-commuting?	Housing provision towards the lower end of the range would lessen increases in the need to travel.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	This level of provision unlikely to provide future workforce to meet employment needs. It will not meet housing needs or address affordability issues.	Housing provision should be sufficient to meet the needs of a growing population and the needs of the local economy. Benefits only likely if higher level of new

Core policy 2: Housing provision of 20,900 dwellings (Option 3) (Refer to section 5.4 main report for further details)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance	Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures		
		T	R	S	L					
										homes required.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	This level of provision unlikely to provide future workforce to meet employment needs.			Increase in housing provision needed to meet future needs of businesses.

## Core Policy 2: Delivery strategy

### Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites

Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No. Uncertain effects. Dependent on location, biodiversity value of site and proximity to sensitive receptors.	LT	I	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	<p>Policies promote development on PDL. Significant impacts less likely than developing Greenfield sites, although some adverse effects still likely as some PDL sites have high biodiversity value.</p> <p>Less impacts likely with a higher PDL target but would depend on site location.</p> <p>Option 3 potentially least impacts as higher PDL targets set for areas with larger amounts of PDL.</p> <p>Option 4 may increase Greenfield loss but effects dependant on location and mitigation proposed.</p>	<p>Adoption of a higher target &lt;50% for the whole of Wiltshire may give better biodiversity protection. Targeting areas with higher amounts of PDL for more housing may help protect biodiversity and possibly best option for this objective.</p> <p>This policy should acknowledge that some PDL sites can have high ecological value and development may not be desirable or appropriate. Increasing density levels may also prevent Greenfield loss.</p>
<b>2. Land and</b>	Significant	LT	I	C	L	++	+	+/?	--	Policies requiring higher targets	The focus should not just be on setting

Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
soil	positive effects through promotion of PDL development									generally more positive against this objective, however Wiltshire does not have large amounts of PDL as other more industrial areas. Option 3 – areas such as Corsham may have a large amount of redundant MOD land but Corsham does not need as many new homes as Chippenham and Trowbridge which have little PDL capacity. Option 4 – no PDL target likely to lead to increased loss of Greenfield land and focus taken away from regeneration of town centres.	a % target – development of PDL should be prioritised in town centres like Trowbridge that need regeneration. There should also be clear links to policies promoting higher density development on PDL in locations that benefit from sustainable transport choices. There may be an argument for directing more houses to areas with higher amounts of PDL to avoid Greenfield development in areas that have little or no PDL. Consideration of remediation costs and use of existing buildings required.
3. Waste management	No but there will be impacts of waste from land remediation.	ST/MT	R	C	L	-	-	-/?	0	Effects against this objective dependent on the site and remediation work required. Not likely to be significant and main issue will be how waste is disposed of.	Waste produced from land remediation should be recycled wherever possible and this issue should be discussed in policy supporting text or in the topic paper. More of an issue with higher targets.
4. Water resources	No. Few impacts against this objective.	ST	R	A	?	0	0	0	0	Developing polluted PDL sites can have issues for surface and ground water. This is dependent on site location and condition and more of an issue where higher PDL targets are required.	There needs to be strong pollution prevention measures in place when remediating polluted sites. This is a matter to be reflected in other Core Strategy policies however.
5. Flood risk	No. Few impacts. Some possible benefits.	LT	R	B	L	0/+	0/+	0/+	-	Promoting development on PDL will protect some Greenfield sites from development. This will reduce issues of surface water runoff from built-up areas. Option 4 will result in increased loss of	Effects dependent on site location. For sites in areas of flood risk a surface water management strategy may be required to demonstrate equivalent to Greenfield runoff post development and an SFRA Level 2 may be required

Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										Greenfield land with likely increased surface water runoff.	if development near or within FZ2 or FZ3. Use of SuDS should be considered if appropriate.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No. Few direct impacts.	MT	R	A	?	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?	Development in any location likely to have impacts on air quality and other forms of pollution. Information would be required on individual sites which is not the focus of this policy.	Development of PDL sites within or near to town centres would benefit from proximity to good public transport services and access to key services and facilities. Option 3 should promote PDL development in those areas with appropriate town centre sites.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No. Some benefits from reduced Greenfield land development	LT	R	B	L	+	0	+	-	If more development occurs on PDL, more Greenfield land is available to play a role in climate change adaptation eg reduced surface water runoff, strategic flood storage etc Option 4 will reduce Greenfield land available for climate change adaptation and increase risk of surface water runoff during periods of high intensity rainfall.	Achievement of higher PDL targets would increase climate change adaptation ability.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No. Limited benefits.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	0/?	+/?	?	Achievement of higher rates of PDL less likely to impact on historic assets as they are sites which have previously been developed. Effects dependant on location and sensitivity of sites concerned.	An archaeological survey should still be undertaken when developing any PDL site with development sensitive to any historic assets in proximity to the site.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Option 3 significant benefits.	LT	R	B	L	+	+	++	--/?	Promoting development on PDL gives opportunities to protect rural landscapes through reduced Greenfield land take and opportunities to improve urban townscapes.	Higher targets than the ones being proposed would further reduce adverse impacts of housing on rural landscapes. However, this may result in much higher densities on the few

Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										<p>Option 3 – significant effects as tailored to individual situations and would reduce pressure on Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Option 4 – no target will significantly increase impacts on rural landscapes including Wiltshire’s significant area of AONB.</p>	areas of PDL left causing adverse impacts in those areas.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Not significant but Option 3 most likely to benefit housing provision.	LT	R	C	L	-	?	+	++	<p>Higher PDL targets likely to have an adverse effect on housing provision as Wiltshire does not have large amounts of PDL.</p> <p>Option 3 takes account of what PDL is available in an area and would give greatest benefits.</p> <p>Option 4 – significant benefits for housing provision. Focus away from PDL may reduce delays that developing PDL can cause allowing greater chance of meeting housing targets.</p>	To ensure no effects on housing provision, very low PDL targets should be adopted so that housing development can come forward in any location.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects.	LT	R	C	L	+	0/?	+	-	<p>A higher PDL target likely to lead to development of remaining PDL sites and benefit town centre regeneration in towns such as Trowbridge and Chippenham. Likely health benefits from improved local economic situation and protection of Greenfield sites that are often highly valued.</p> <p>Option 4 – increased loss of Greenfield sites and focus away from town centre regeneration.</p>	PDL sites need to be viable and allow for the same level of developer contributions/S106 that can fund health related services and facilities. Housing densities on PDL sites should not be so high that they make an area less desirable as a place to live and also affect crime and fear of crime.

Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites											
Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects.	MT	R	C	L	+	+	+	+	Some benefits from all options in terms of creating employment and housing provision, particularly on PDL in town centre locations that can benefit from proximity to key services/facilities and public transport.	This policy should actively promote the development of PDL sites in or near to town centres that can aid regeneration, and local people should be involved in the design and implementation of such schemes.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects.	LT	R	C	L	+	0/?	+	-	A higher PDL target likely to lead to development of remaining PDL sites and benefit town centre regeneration in towns such as Trowbridge and Chippenham. This is likely to benefit key community facilities in town centres. However, development must ensure same level of developer contributions/S106 towards such facilities as is available from Greenfield development. Option 4 will not benefit key services/facilities in town centres.	PDL sites need to be viable and allow for the same level of developer contributions/S106 that can fund community services and facilities, particularly in town centres. Remediation of sites may lead to reduced contributions if sites to remain viable.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects.	LT	R	C	L	+	0/?	+	0	No significant effects likely. A higher PDL target could benefit regeneration and this would stimulate the local economy more, helping to retain jobs and skills.	Any development will need to generate sufficient developer contributions/S106 to allow for educational provision.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No significant effects.	LT	R	C	L	+	0/?	+	-	No significant effects likely. A higher PDL target likely to focus development of sites in town centres which will benefit from sustainable transport modes and help viability of public transport.	Policy must allow town centre PDL sites to be developed to benefit public transport viability.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Significant benefits if there is	LT	I	C	L	++/?	+/?	++/?	+/?	Higher PDL targets can significantly benefit the local economy if it leads to	The agreed PDL target must allow regeneration to take place but not



Core Policy 2: Achieving an appropriate balance between development of previously developed land (PDL) and greenfield sites												
Options 1- 4 (see section 5.4 main report for details of options)												
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures	
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4			
	enough land available.										town centre regeneration and that is where many PDL sites are located. However, there are uncertainties as to how a higher target will affect housing and employment provision if not enough PDL is available. Option 4 – benefits but focus away from regeneration efforts.	make housing and employment provision unviable. Option 3 would also ensure that PDL sites in those areas that have a large amount are developed and this can also aid regeneration.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Not significant but Option 3 most likely to benefit employment provision.	LT	R	C	L	-	?	+	+		Higher PDL targets likely to have an adverse effect on employment provision as Wiltshire does not have large amounts of PDL. Option 3 takes account of what PDL is available in an area and would give greatest benefits. Option 4 will allow employment provision but will not promote the development of town centre PDL sites.	To ensure no effects on employment provision, very low PDL targets should be adopted so that housing development can come forward in any location. However, no target would not stimulate development of those sites which require remediation – often sites which are suitable for employment and in town centres.

### Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements												
Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)												
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures		
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3				
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 3.	LT	R	B	L	-	-	++			Current policies cover a limited range of infrastructure and are inconsistent. They do not cover biodiversity enhancement or Green Infrastructure (GI).	Several small developments in an area can have significant cumulative effects in terms of habitat fragmentation and species disturbance. Any policy needs to take this

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									Option 2 does not include CIL and there will be severe restrictions on pooled contributions that can mitigate cumulative effects on biodiversity and help create a wider GI network. Much GI not site specific but covers a wider area. Option 3 and CIL adoption much more likely to provide significant GI benefits over a wider area, and more scope for pooled contributions for sub-regional GI and to mitigate cumulative effects.	into consideration and also provide contributions towards a strategic GI network that can have significant environmental, economic and social benefits.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	Policy options cover infrastructure delivery of development in any location. It is not a policy for promoting development in any particular location. Few effects likely.	Development in more sustainable locations eg town centres, can often make use of existing infrastructure such as roads, water infrastructure, energy, public transport and other services/facilities. Core Strategy policy should promote development in those locations in preference to greenfield sites.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	MT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	+	It is not known how current policy performs in terms of providing waste infrastructure. However, current policies are not based on an up-to-date evidence base and are inconsistent across the former districts. Options 2 and 3 offer a more consistent approach and this is more likely to provide appropriate waste infrastructure that help reduce waste and/or allow more accessible recycling facilities. Option 2 - Section 106 agreements are	Most waste infrastructure likely to be directly related to the development although Option 2 may not bring forward all necessary waste infrastructure if not directly site specific. Other policies in the Core Strategy will need to consider ways of reducing waste such as through building design and layout and also consideration of construction waste.

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									severely limited in terms of what can be achieved by pooled contributions.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Possibly significant benefits from CIL depending on type of projects funded.	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+/ ++ ?	Option 2 may have benefits from a more consistent approach but this will be mainly focused on site-specific infrastructure. Many water related issues occur away from development areas eg River Avon SAC phosphate issues. CIL could provide significant benefits for acknowledged water issues.	Consideration of funding through CIL towards River Avon Phosphate Management Plan – this is a regional issue. Pooled contributions towards this and many other issues caused by cumulative impacts of small developments which in the past have not contributed enough.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Possibly significant benefits from CIL depending on type of projects funded.	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+/ ++ ?	Similar to 4 above. Many flood problems caused by cumulative impacts of many developments and occur over a wider area. CIL gives fewer restrictions on collecting pooled contributions towards local, sub-regional or regional infrastructure than under s106 agreements alone.	Consideration is needed of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. All necessary infrastructure to reduce flood risk required before development goes ahead.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Likely significant benefits, particularly through transport schemes.	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+/ ++ ?	CIL Bill (April, 2010) narrowed the scope of Section 106 agreements down to the provision of on-site infrastructure and affordable housing, while the rest of the benefits from development will be paid for through CIL. Many air quality and noise related issues caused by traffic. CIL likely to be the best vehicle for funding transport related infrastructure which is often required away from development site.	Provision of infrastructure should focus on reducing the need to travel by increasing self-containment, providing key services/facilities close to where people live and investing in sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling routes and public transport schemes.

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Benefits but not significant.	LT	R	B	L	-	0	+	Impacts on climate change, mainly through greenhouse gas emissions, are often cumulative. Energy use in home will mainly be influenced by CSH and changes to Building Regulations. CIL can provide mitigation and adaptation infrastructure that will often be away from a particular site and not always directly related.	Need to consider pooling of contributions towards non-site specific schemes for mitigation and enhancement and benefits of local projects such as small-scale flood alleviation schemes, renewable energy schemes, allotments etc.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Benefits but not significant.	LT	R	B	L	-	0	+	CIL may allow more funding for enhancement of heritage assets through wider range of infrastructure being considered. Many impacts on the historic environment occur cumulatively from small developments and individual buildings.	Maintenance and improvement of Wiltshire's heritage assets is required, including the storage of archaeological remains. Small-scale, local work could be carried out by local communities on heritage assets through CIL monies.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Significant landscape benefits possible through CIL.	LT	R	B	L	-	+	++	Option 2 only likely to have benefits on-site through landscaping, buffering etc. Option 3 could lead to larger scale strategic protection and enhancement in rural and urban areas, and contribute to provision of strategic GI network.	Cumulative impacts of small developments are important and often negligible contributions in the past. A number of small developments can have a similar adverse effect as one large development and there is scope to reduce or mitigate these effects through CIL.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects	MT	R	C	L	+	-	-/?	There are uncertainties as to how affordable housing will be funded. Through S106 or CIL? It could be argued that at present insufficient contributions are being made overall, particularly by smaller developments. This could make housing viability better for developers. There is a risk that the rate of CIL set	The eventual CIL charging schedule will need to ensure that it does not place undue burden on developers in current economic climate, and with government's pro-growth agenda in mind. There is a risk that developers will be asked to fund too much, this cost will be passed onto house buyers, pushing up the cost of homes.

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									could make some development unviable in the current economic climate.	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects	MT	R	C	L	0	-/?	+/?	Adoption of CIL likely to give wider range of benefits than S106 alone. Many infrastructure requirements are for off-site services and facilities eg healthcare facilities, GI etc and these would not be provided through s106 under new regulations.	Policy must allow for provision of wide range of services and facilities that are required as a result of new development, including healthcare facilities, and allow healthier lifestyles and reduction in health inequalities.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	Yes if greater community involvement through CIL	MT	R	C	L	-	-/?	+/++	Current policy covers a limited range of infrastructure and will not benefit this objective. Under Option 2, severe restrictions on pooled contributions and non site-specific infrastructure. Option 3 may offer much greater benefits for community projects and community involvement in design and decision-making tailored to local needs.	Under Option 3 there must be much greater scope for existing residents and local community to decide how money is spent. They have knowledge on what the needs are locally. Infrastructure needs include services that can help increase social cohesion and inclusion.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	Yes if greater community involvement in provision through CIL	MT	R	C	L	-	-/?	+/++	As above. Many needs for community services and facilities will occur away from the development. Option 3 will allow fewer restrictions in pooled contributions towards existing community facilities and allow community involvement in what money is spent on.	Policy must allow greater scope for existing residents and local community to decide how money is spent. They have knowledge on what the needs are locally. Infrastructure needs include services that can help increase social cohesion and inclusion.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects	MT	R	C	L	0	-/?	+/?	Current policy ensures education provision. Option 2 covers site-specific infrastructure and will not provide for educational needs away from development eg secondary education.	Need to ensure appropriate contributions towards educational provision, particularly from the many smaller developments. Also, that local businesses are supported and allowed to expand through provision of

Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements Options 1-3 (see section 5.5 main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									Option 3 will ensure smaller developments make appropriate contributions.	employment land
<b>15. Transport</b>	No significant effects	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	+/?	Many transport related projects are needed away from the development itself, due to often indirect increases in journeys and traffic. Option 2 would not provide for this infrastructure. Option 3 will benefit but debateable whether significant improvement over current situation.	Focus of infrastructure provision must be on providing mixed-use development, local facilities that reduce need to travel and contributions towards significant provision of sustainable travel choice. More investment in roads will not reduce car use.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects.	LT	R	B	L	-	-/?	+/?	Benefits from Option 3 if it allows business development and infrastructure that benefits local economy. Depends on what infrastructure provided and also if regeneration occurs.	Infrastructure provision must increase opportunities for job creation and local businesses. Appropriate retail, leisure and other services should be directed to town centre locations and where provided locally must not compete with town centres.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects.	MT	R	C	L	0	-/?	+/?	Option 2 will not provide for off-site employment land or help viability of existing employment areas. Adoption of CIL may provide benefits for employment provision away from development site.	Particularly important that housing development provides contributions towards land for employment and job creation that benefits the local economy. Especially relevant when sole housing proposed.

#### Core Policy 4: Spatial Strategy: Amesbury Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>1</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.6 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

<sup>1</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)

## Core Policy 5: Porton Down

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.7 main report for further details.

<b>South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)</b>
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	+	Access to employment is related to general health and well being. The facility also carries out health related work of national importance.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	-	Given the location of Porton Down, the proposed AAP should include a requirement for a Green Travel Plan for any development proposals to ensure that future employees are not totally reliant on the private vehicle for travel to work. This will avoid increase from vehicle related carbon emissions and the potential adverse impact.
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	-	Given the location of Porton Down, the proposed AAP should include a requirement for a Green Travel Plan for any development proposals to ensure that future employees are not totally reliant on the private vehicle for travel to work. This will support this objective and avoid the potential adverse impact.
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	New development will be on greenfield land but decanting could lead to more use of undeveloped land.
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral impact

14. Maintain and improve river quality	0	Neutral impact
15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	The policy and supporting text recognise that the site is of international importance for biodiversity and that any development proposals should be subject to site level HRA. However, without that information it is must be assumed that there is potential for adverse impact.
16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes	0	Neutral impact
17. Facilitate economic growth & development of new businesses	++	The policy supports the existing business and will retain employment opportunities in this specialised field.
18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth	+	Infrastructure is in place to serve the site.
19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills	0	Neutral impact
20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities	0	Neutral impact
21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres	0	Neutral impact
22. Promote development of highest standard	0	Neutral impact
23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites	0	Neutral impact

### Core Policy 6: Stonehenge

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.8 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
1. Social inclusion for all	0	Neutral effect
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	0	Neutral effect
3. Improve health and well being of population	+	Provision of employment, which is protected by this policy, is beneficial for health and well being.
4. Improve safety and reduce crime	0	Neutral effect
5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities	0	Neutral effect
6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace	0	Neutral effect
7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from	0	Neutral effect



renewable sources		
8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling	0	Neutral effect
9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	0	Neutral effect
10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas	0	Neutral effect
11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use	0	Neutral effect
12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency	0	Neutral effect
13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion	0	Neutral effect
14. Maintain and improve river quality	0	Neutral effect
15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	0	Neutral effect
16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes	0	Neutral effect
17. Facilitate economic growth & development of new businesses	0	Neutral effect
18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth	0	Neutral effect
19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills	0	Neutral effect
20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities	+	The policy directly progresses this objective.
21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres	+	As some of these facilities will be in town centres the policy supports the objective of maintaining and enhancing the viability of town centres.
22. Promote development of highest standard	0	Neutral effect
23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites	?	The effect on Stonehenge will only be able to be assessed when full details are available.

### Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area

Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.9 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	Yes	LT	R	A	L	--/?	--/?	Potential significant effects which may result	Development should be promoted in appropriate

Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.9 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	Both options							in development occurring in locations that would increase impacts on bats. HRA has considered potential loss of bat foraging grounds associated with the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC. These issues have been highlighted through the sustainability appraisal and HRA Report. The preferred allocation for the town is a Greenfield site adjacent to a greater horseshoe transition/hibernation roost. The majority of impacts in this area will probably come through cumulative effects of multiple small scale developments and these cumulative effects can be addressed through a developers guidance document and site level AA.	locations where adverse effects are minimised. Adverse effects regarding Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are capable of being assessed and resolved through the provision and implementation of design guidance. Site level AA may be required. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-/?	Both options will lead to loss of Greenfield land. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	-/?	No specific issues with strategic allocation. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations that increase impacts on water resources.	Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to

Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.9 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								River Avon corridor will need specific consideration, protection and enhancement. This settlement should include an exemplar Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) scheme as part of the sustainable development outcomes.	increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	Identified strategic site within flood zone 1. However, loss of permeable surfaces will increase surface water runoff.	Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will be required where appropriate and mitigation including flood storage and appropriate design (including architectural layout and SuDS) can reduce flooding risk both on and off site.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Existing air quality issues in Bradford on Avon. Further development likely to lead to increased traffic through the town.	A transport assessment is required for all major applications which must include an assessment of the likely future impacts of the Kingston Mills development and demonstrate how development will not exacerbate the existing AQMA. A sustainable transport solution is needed for the town centre which should include a safe pedestrian and cycling route from the strategic site to the town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	?	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel. Not considered significant due to lower level of growth than other community areas.	Development will need to meet high standards of sustainable design and energy efficiency and should incorporate renewable energy provision, to contribute to the town's aspirations to be carbon neutral.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Level of growth proposed likely to lead to some adverse effects. Conservation Areas may be affected, depending on location of development. Potential adverse effects on 'The Hall' grade 1 listed building and registered park and garden on edge of	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Impacts on 'The Hall', in particular, will require mitigation. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.

Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.9 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								strategic site.	
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	Growth is proposed on Greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area. Potential landscape impacts on rural character, Cotswolds AONB which is approx 1km to the west of Kingston Farm and green belt. There are potential local landscape impacts from the strategic site due to its location above the river valley. The site forms the upper section of the south facing valley slope and the easternmost field of the Kingston Farm site is in a visually prominent location.	Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on the AONB or local landscape designations, or where it would significantly impact upon rural character. Good quality design required that reflects local character. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts on the AONB, green belt and identify suitable mitigation.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+/?	Proposals for 670 new homes in community area. Option 2 may not deliver appropriate level of affordable housing or corresponding infrastructure.	Established affordability issues in Bradford on Avon. Appropriate level of affordable housing required.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Air quality issues a concern. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Air quality concerns can be reduced through reducing need to travel and providing safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to town centre.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Benefits associated with modern housing provision and employment land. Strategic site relatively close to town centre to allow good access. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of growth can provide contributions to new and existing community facilities.	Growth must be matched by appropriate infrastructure provision.

Core Policy 7: Spatial Strategy: Bradford on Avon Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.9 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Historic loss of employment land in BoA due to conversion to residential. New employment development essential to reduce out-commuting and increase self-containment.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	This level of development in Bradford on Avon will have adverse effects on traffic within the town, despite proximity of strategic site to town centre.	Further transport assessment required. Significant investment in sustainable transport solutions to reduce through town traffic.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Benefits through option 1 for local economy but benefits may be reduced due to traffic impacts.	Solutions must be found for transport and air quality issues for growth to really benefit local economy.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	There is a need to increase employment opportunities in BoA. An increased amount of employment land may be required to address out-commuting.

### Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area

Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.10 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	- /?	No specific issues at this stage. No strategic housing sites. Most new development likely to be on Greenfield	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible.

Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.10 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								land with impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	-- / ?	-- / ?	Both options will lead to significant loss of Greenfield land due to lack of brownfield sites in community area. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	- / ?	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place. The waste facilities located on the edge of Calne are a particular source of heavy vehicles and further work is needed to identify an appropriate solution to reducing the impact of this traffic on the town.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	- / ?	No major watercourses in proximity to proposed employment site at Beaverbrook farm and Porte Marsh. Option 2 unlikely to provide adequate infrastructure and protection. The River Marden runs through the centre of Calne and will need to be considered when development is being planned for the town centre.	Development will need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	?	No strategic sites in Calne. No specific	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS

Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.10 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								issues with identified employment site. Significant level of housing on Greenfield land will increase surface water runoff. Option 2 may not provide essential infrastructure eg SuDS.	but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. Specific consideration of issues if development in town centre re River Marden.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Some traffic congestion issues in town centre. Level of growth likely to exacerbate any air quality issues.	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centre. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to increase in greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	?	-	No specific issues known. However, level of growth likely to adversely affect heritage assets in some areas. Option 2 may allow development in locations that damage heritage assets.	The eastern part of the Calne Community Area borders the Avebury section of the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site. It is therefore important that future development is sensitive to the setting of the World Heritage Site. Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	I	A	L	-	-/?	Level of housing growth proposed will likely cause some landscape impacts	Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on the AONB or

Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.10 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
landscapes								depending on location and design. The community area includes parts of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations that adversely affect the AONB.	local landscape designations, or where it would significantly impact upon rural character. Good quality design required that reflects local character. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts on the AONB and identify suitable mitigation.
10. Housing	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and



Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy: Calne Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.10 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								educational infrastructure provision.	attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Options 1 and 2	LT	R	A	L	--	--	Level of housing provision likely to significantly increase traffic volumes, exacerbating existing congestion issues and increasing out-commuting. The level of employment land allocated will not be enough to increase self-containment within Calne. The waste facilities located on the edge of Calne are a particular source of heavy vehicles and further work is needed to identify an appropriate solution to reducing the impact of this traffic on the town.	Significant investment in sustainable transport solutions, particularly if development located in edge of town locations, and to reduce through town traffic. The impact of any future development on the strategic road network must be taken into consideration with appropriate contributions to demand management solutions.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Options 1 and 2	LT	R	A	L	++	++	Both options will have significant benefits for local economy through housing growth. This may also help provide a wider range of retail, cultural and community facilities that are currently lacking in Calne.	None
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Benefits from provision of employment land. Employment land provision now increased from 3.2ha to 6ha.	Consideration of higher level of employment provision recommended in June 2011. Employment land provision now increased from 3.2ha to 6ha.

## Core Policy 9: Chippenham Central Areas of Opportunity

Core Policy 9: Chippenham Central Areas of Opportunity Options 1-2 (see section 5.11 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	-	Both options will allow for regeneration of brownfield sites which will reduce loss of Greenfield land. Policy proposes enhancement of river avon corridor role as wildlife corridor. Some concerns over potential conflicts with recreational uses. Option 2 is more permissive and leaves more up to the market – no benefits likely for biodiversity.	All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Further research required into effects on wildlife from increased recreational/leisure use of river Avon corridor.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	+	+	Both options allow for regeneration of brownfield sites within the centre of Chippenham. Not considered significant due to the number of sites policy is considering.	Consideration of any remediation of contaminated sites must be given prior to any development in accordance with Core Strategy policy 'Contaminated Land'.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects against this objective.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	?	Benefits likely through enhancement of river Avon corridor. Uncertainty over possible impacts on Avon from construction activities and recreational use but overall enhancement should be beneficial in medium-long term. Many town centre potential sites including Hygrade Factory are in close proximity to the river Avon and impacts will need strong mitigation.	Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies, delivered through planning conditions, should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water And use SuDS when appropriate.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	?	Precise effects cannot be established at this stage; however the SFRA suggests that flooding issues are capable of mitigation through correct design and siting for the	Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will be required where appropriate and mitigation including flood storage and appropriate design (including architectural layout and SUDS) can reduce flooding

Core Policy 9: Chippenham Central Areas of Opportunity Options 1-2 (see section 5.11 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								development proposed. Site specific proposals will need to be carefully considered. Option 1, with its emphasis on the river might create opportunities for flood storage and mitigation using natural means.	risk both on and off site.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0/?	0	No specific concerns. Development is supported on brownfield sites in the centre of Chippenham. Development can take advantage of sustainable transport services in local area. Some concerns over disturbance to wildlife along river Avon corridor (noise/light/tranquillity) from increased recreational use.	Additional Core Strategy policies should promote sustainable transport and other means to cut pollution, including demand management. Further research required into effects on wildlife from increased recreational/leisure use of river Avon corridor.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	0	Both options promote development but also greater self containment in a sustainable location that can take advantage of sustainable transport services in local area. This is a very specific policy affecting a very small area and effects on global climate change considered neutral.	National and Core Strategy policies can facilitate mitigation through energy efficiency, use of renewable and low/zero carbon energy sources, investment in sustainable transport solutions, urban layout and suitable planting and landscaping.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-/?	Redevelopment of brownfield sites proposed. Option 1 contains a commitment to high quality design and sustainability standards and overall this policy should benefit the historic environment in Chippenham town centre. It seems more likely to deliver an outcome favourable to heritage interests than the more market focussed Option 2.	Supporting development management policies and SPDs can considerably reduce negative effects, and in some cases bring about improvements. Development of key urban sites should be carefully controlled and heritage interests secured through planning conditions.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+/?	Benefits likely overall for landscape/townscape from redevelopment of brownfield sites and enhancement of river Avon as a wildlife corridor, linking with the wider GI	A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation on a site by site basis.

Core Policy 9: Chippenham Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.11 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								network.	
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Some opportunities for housing on some sites.	Promotion of additional, higher density housing in the centre of Chippenham would maximise benefits against this objective.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0	Some health benefits associated with recreation and leisure opportunities and job creation. Option 2 may not achieve benefits without enhancement of river Avon corridor.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	Benefits from both options through regeneration, job creation and increasing sustainable transport access.	None
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	+/?	Focussing development into existing urban areas will facilitate enhanced infrastructure investment through the IDP. This will be of benefit to community facilities, especially in the town centre. As such both policies would serve this SA objective. However, commitment to such facilities is higher in Option 1. The more market led Option 2 might see market forces spreading investment more thinly.	None for option 1. Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong policies requiring, inter alia, higher developer infrastructure contributions.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	+	Some benefits through job creation and skills retention, as well as attracting inward investment into Chippenham.	None
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Focussing development into existing urban areas will facilitate enhanced transport infrastructure investment, including demand reduction, junction improvements and sustainable transport modes through the IDP. However, Option 1 contains a stronger	Demand management and appropriate use of technology / public transport support could reduce vehicle emissions.

Core Policy 9: Chippenham Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.11 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								commitment to sustainable transport and is more likely to deliver a significantly positive outcome.	
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	C	L	++	+/?	Both options will focus development into existing urban areas, increasing viability for local services and facilities and reducing travelling times, boosting productivity and viability. In particular this is likely to be of benefit in improving the self containment and vitality of Chippenham, for example by enhancing the retail and leisure sectors. However, Option 1 contains a greater commitment to the town as a functioning social and economic unit, rather than just as a series of development opportunities. This makes it more likely that this option would deliver a better and more cohesive retail and general economic environment than a more market led one.	None for Option 1 Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong development management policies aimed at securing economic growth.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No Option 1	MT	R	C	L	+	+/?	Redevelopment of town centre brownfield sites will increase employment opportunities, particularly from retail, in Chippenham. It is unclear how many jobs would result from the two sites stated in the policy. Redevelopment at Langley Park may benefit in future from any new railway crossing to access future development at Rawlings Farm.	Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong development management policies aimed at securing economic growth.

## Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area

Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.12 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 2	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	<p>There are specific issues concerning development in Chippenham in relation to the River Avon and Birds Marsh Wood. These issues have been discussed in the assessments for strategic sites in Chippenham. If development is to take place in proximity to these sensitive areas, strong protection and enhancement measures will be required, including long-term management.</p> <p>Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors and less consideration of infrastructure that could reduce impacts.</p> <p>Development of brownfield sites – it should be noted that brownfield sites can be important habitats (in some cases a UK BAP priority habitat – Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land), and in these situations, reuse should not necessarily be maximised.</p>	<p>Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible.</p> <p>All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.</p> <p>Specific mitigation required to avoid/reduce impacts on River Avon and Birds Marsh Wood, including use of buffer zones and reducing recreational pressures through access management.</p>
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	--	<p>Both options will involve significant loss of Greenfield land, some of which is designated as best and most versatile agricultural land. Limited brownfield sites available for this level of growth.</p> <p>Considering the proposed housing numbers and relative lack of brownfield sites, impacts hard to avoid.</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.</p> <p>Locating development on the edge of existing urban area with good transport links to town centre will improve the sustainability of the option.</p>

Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.12 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	C	L	--	-- / ?	Proposed significant levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	C	L	--	--	Significant level of development proposed will significantly increase water demand. Specific issues regarding development in proximity to River Avon. Discussed in greater detail in strategic site allocation assessments.	Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution and other impacts on River Avon and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Significant areas of flood risk associated mainly with River Avon. Flood zones 2 and 3 can be avoided on all proposed sites therefore not considered significant. The SFRA suggests that flooding issues are capable of mitigation through correct design and siting for the development proposed. Site specific proposals will need to be carefully considered.	Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will be required where appropriate. Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. Further detail in individual strategic site assessments.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Both options would result in growth which could adversely affect air quality and other forms of pollution. This is covered in individual site assessments. Option 2 would be more likely to result in a dispersed settlement pattern and higher overall emissions due to unmitigated travel patterns.	Development in Chippenham will require comprehensive transport infrastructure which may include eastern/southern distributor roads and dualling of A350 depending on eventual preferred sites. Current traffic congestion and air quality issues which must be resolved through further transport assessment.
<b>7. Climatic</b>	Yes	LT	I	B	L	--	--	Both options promote significant growth	Significant level of emissions will occur through

Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.12 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>factors</b>	Both options							which will lead to significant greenhouse gas emissions from energy use and travel. Option 1 would be more likely to promote a sustainable pattern of development, enhancing self containment but effects still likely to be significant against this objective.	energy use and travel but these can be reduced through high levels of building sustainability, onsite renewable and zero/low carbon heat and energy generation. Mixed-use development can reduce need to travel but strong consideration of sustainable transport modes necessary.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Depending on eventual location of development some effects likely. Specific areas of concern include town centre Conservation Area, Rowden Manor and River Avon meadows.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	There are no national landscape designations constraining development in Chippenham. However, development has the potential to adversely affect Rowden Conservation Area and its setting - this extends along the River Avon between the urban area and countryside to the south. The River Avon heavily influences local character. Consideration should also be given to impacts on the Special Landscape Areas to the south west and south east of Chippenham.	Any development should be sensitive to the rural character of the area around Chippenham. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation. Limited information available at present with regards design of development. Mitigation is possible. Good quality design required that reflects local character. ROWs should be maintained and incorporated into development, along with a significant GI network that will provide many biodiversity and recreational benefits.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy



Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.12 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	C	L	++	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have significant benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	A	L	++	-	Significant benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	A	L	++	-	Significant level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	B	L	--	--/?	Level of growth proposed is likely to increase private car use generally, despite any investment in sustainable transport infrastructure. There are currently serious issues with congestion on the A350, A4 and through the town centre, particularly during peak times.  Further traffic modelling will be required to provide clarification that is beyond the scope of this sustainability appraisal. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Mixed-use development will help increase self-containment and reduce need to travel. Further traffic modelling required, in particular to gauge effects on Chippenham town centre and on A350/A4. Significant new highways infrastructure required will be very expensive and may restrict other infrastructure provision.

Core Policy 10: Spatial Strategy: Chippenham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.12 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	B	L	++	+	The level of growth proposed will have many benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. Significant employment opportunities through provision of employment land. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	New development should have strong and accessible links to Chippenham town centre to help aid regeneration of the town centre. Provision of a larger area for employment use would increase benefits and help reduce the noted issue of out-commuting. Strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure will help reduce potential traffic congestion, particularly on A350 and A4.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	B	L	++	+	Significant employment opportunities through provision of approx 31.5-34 ha of employment land. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	New development should have strong and accessible links to Chippenham town centre to help aid regeneration of the town centre. Provision of a larger area for employment use would increase benefits and help reduce the noted issue of out-commuting. Strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure will help reduce potential traffic congestion, particularly on A350 and A4.

## Core Policy 11: Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area

Core Policy 11: Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.13 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 2	MT	R	A	L	-/?	--/?	<p>Potential significant effect Option 2 as development likely in less sustainable locations and with inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>HRA noted potential for disturbance to bats and loss of bat foraging grounds. Option 1 will allow sites to come forward in more sustainable locations that will reduce impacts on SAC.</p> <p>Development of brownfield sites – it should be noted that brownfield sites can be important habitats (in some cases a UK BAP priority habitat – Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land), and in these situations, reuse should not necessarily be maximised.</p>	<p>Development should be promoted in appropriate locations where adverse effects are minimised. Adverse effects regarding Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are capable of being assessed and resolved through the provision and implementation of design guidance. Project level AA may be required.</p> <p>All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.</p>
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	+	-/?	<p>Policy strongly promotes redevelopment of ex MOD sites. Some greenfield still likely to be lost.</p> <p>Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.</p> <p>Focus of new development must be ex MOD brownfield sites.</p>
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	<p>Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced.</p> <p>Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.</p>	<p>Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.</p>
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--	<p>All of Corsham is within a groundwater Source Protection Zone 2 which should be mentioned in the policy. Option 1 can</p>	<p>There is a requirement for the appropriate use of SuDS and there should be careful consideration of the types of development proposed for this</p>

Core Policy 11: Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.13 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								ensure greater protection of water resources in Corsham than not having a specific policy.	settlement to mitigate groundwater impacts.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Potential flood risk issues with proposed scale of development. Effects will depend on location, type of development and mitigation measures employed. Development of brownfield sites in Corsham may help reduce flood risk.	Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will be required where appropriate and mitigation including flood storage and appropriate design (including architectural layout and SUDS) can reduce flooding risk both on and off site.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	No specific issues. Level of growth will add to traffic levels and air quality issues. Option 1, if development occurs on brownfield sites, will allow development in more sustainable locations that can benefit from existing public transport services.	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centre. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	?	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to higher greenhouse gas emissions overall.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-/?	Policy encourages the re-use of historic buildings in Corsham to sustain and maintain the character and identity of the town. Focus on brownfield sites will also reduce impacts. Option 2 – may lead to greenfield development with unknown impacts.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Likely adverse effects on local landscape	Development should be avoided, where

Core Policy 11: Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.13 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
landscapes								character and Cotswolds AONB. Will depend on location and nature of development. Option 2 - may lead to greenfield development with unknown impacts.	possible, where it would adversely impact on the AONB or impact upon rural character. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.
10. Housing	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure provision to be addressed.
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Corsham has seen significant housing growth in recent years which has not been accompanied by appropriate increases in services and facilities. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through likely community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Corsham has seen significant housing growth in recent years which has not been accompanied by appropriate increases in services and facilities. Option 2 provides	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.

Core Policy 11: Spatial Strategy: Corsham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.13 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								no certainty of appropriate infrastructure provision.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of appropriate employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Level of growth will increase traffic levels overall. Option 1 likely to focus development in more sustainable locations on brownfield sites which may reduce effects.	Mixed-use development can reduce need to travel and there must be appropriate investment in sustainable transport links, particularly with the town centre.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing and employment proposed and focus on brownfield site regeneration. Option 2 would not encourage redevelopment of brownfield sites.	Consideration of higher level of employment provision to allow broader range of employment diversity.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from provision of employment land. Policy states that provision not limited to 6Ha and this will address imbalance created by significant housing growth in recent years.	None.

## Core Policy 12: Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area

Core Policy 12: Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area Options 1-3 (see section 5.14 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	0	No specific issues at this stage. Most new development likely to be on Greenfield land with impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible and avoiding impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	--	-/?	Limited brownfield sites available for this level of growth. Options 1 and 2 provide for a significant amount of new housing on Greenfield sites. Option 3 would restrict development and effects may not be as significant.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	0	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place. Option 3 would restrict development and effects may not be as significant.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	?	No specific issues. Increased water demand generally. Option 1 will allow more appropriate infrastructure to be provided in Devizes. Key issue: reinforcement is needed to the water supply network and of the sewer system, including likely relocation of discharge points.	Recommended that the requirement for SuDS is mentioned in the policy. Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	0	No strategic housing sites in Devizes. Significant level of housing on Greenfield	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as

Core Policy 12: Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area Options 1-3 (see section 5.14 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									land will increase surface water runoff. Option 2 may not provide essential infrastructure eg SuDS. Option 3 – restricted development - less Greenfield land needed.	surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Both options	LT/ ST	R	A	L	--/?	--/?	-/?	Significant air quality issues in Devizes. AQMAs. Options 1 and 2 will lead to significant amount of development. Option 3 restricts growth and will lead to lesser impacts. Traffic congestion has led to several AQMAs being declared in Devizes. Measures to improve air quality in Devizes need to be considered and could be seen as a constraint to further growth in the short term.	Significant focus on sustainable transport schemes needed and essential transport infrastructure. Further research is being undertaken to understand traffic movements in Devizes. Need to improve transport infrastructure before significant new development takes place.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	B	L	--	--	-	Proposals for 2150 new homes in the CA will significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and transport. Option 3 restricted development – fewer impacts.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	0/?	No specific issues at this stage as no strategic housing sites proposed. However, level of growth likely to adversely affect heritage assets in some areas. Option 2 may allow development in locations that damage heritage assets. Option 3 restricted development – fewer impacts.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban</b>	Yes	LT	I	A	L	--/?	--/?	-	Growth on scale proposed could	Development should be avoided, where



Core Policy 12: Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area Options 1-3 (see section 5.14 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
landscapes	Both options								significantly impact on the AONB. Issues with development at land between A361 and Horton Rd affecting the AONB have been highlighted in the SA/SEA. Highly visible from AONB. Future housing sites also likely to significantly impact on AONB.	possible, where it would adversely impact on AONB. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation. Development to the north and east of Devizes particularly sensitive.
10. Housing	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	+	High level of housing proposed. Significant benefits. Option 3 restricted development – fewer benefits. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	0	Level of housing and employment proposed may have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation but may also exacerbate air quality issues. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Air quality issues must be resolved as potential for effects on health.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	0	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Options 2 and 3 provide no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	0	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
14. Education and	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	0	Good level of employment provision	Devizes has a good range of small-medium

Core Policy 12: Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area Options 1-3 (see section 5.14 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
skills									through Option 1 will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Options 2 and 3 provide no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	sized businesses. Providing for a range of employment growth at Devizes will help to further diversify the existing offer in the town, ensuring that it remains an area of key economic importance in Wiltshire.
15. Transport	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--/?	-	Level of growth proposed will significantly increase traffic volumes through Devizes, exacerbating air quality issues.	Growth proposed may need to be reduced unless long-term solutions can be found to traffic issues. If proposed growth kept at this level long-term solutions must be found. Further transport assessment required. Significant investment in sustainable transport solutions.
16. Economy	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-	-/?	Benefits through option 1 for local economy but benefits may be reduced due to traffic impacts.	Solutions must be found for transport and air quality issues for growth to really benefit local economy.
17. Employment	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	-/?	Good level of employment provision through Option 1 will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Options 2 and 3 provide no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	Devizes has a good range of small-medium sized businesses. Providing for a range of employment growth at Devizes will help to further diversify the existing offer in the town, ensuring that it remains an area of key economic importance in Wiltshire.

## Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area

Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.15 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. No strategic development sites. River Avon will require protection from any development impacts. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible. New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Avon floodplain. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	-- / ?	Both options will lead to loss of Greenfield land. Limited brownfield sites available for this level of growth. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues. Increased water demand generally from both options. River Avon will require protection from any development impacts. Option 1 will allow more appropriate infrastructure to be provided in Malmesbury and give better protection for River Avon floodplain.	New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Avon floodplain with regard to biodiversity issues. Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No strategic sites proposed. No specific	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS

Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.15 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								issues with identified employment site. Significant level of housing on Greenfield land will increase surface water runoff. Option 2 may not provide essential infrastructure eg SuDS.	but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. Specific consideration of issues if development in proximity to River Avon.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Some traffic congestion issues in town centre. Level of growth likely to exacerbate air quality issues.	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centre. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centre.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to increase in greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	--/?	Malmesbury has a high quality historic environment. Some effects likely from this level of development. Option 2 likely to bring forward development in unsuitable locations.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	-/?	-/?	Landscape impacts likely through level of development and rural character of area. Cotswolds AONB covers part of community area. No strategic allocations so effects difficult to quantify at this stage.	Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on AONB. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic

Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.15 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									congestion issues to be addressed.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through likely community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	-/?	At this stage primary schools close to capacity. Level of growth will exacerbate issues without appropriate resolution. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Good access to M4 and A429. Known congestion issues in town centre. Level of growth likely to increase traffic volumes generally placing pressures on existing infrastructure.	A transport assessment is required for any development proposal, in particular identifying how suitable demand management approaches can reduce congestion of the road network in the town centre.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits for local economy from proposed level of housing and employment. Option 2 provides no certainty of level of employment or infrastructure provision which could damage the local economy.	None.
<b>17.</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Benefits from provision of employment land.	Consideration of higher level of employment

Core Policy 13: Spatial Strategy: Malmesbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.15 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
Employment								Employment land provision now increased from 0.9ha to 3ha.	provision recommended in June 2011. Employment land provision now increased from 0.9ha to 3ha.

### Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area

Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.16 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. Policy text recognises that several sites of nature conservation importance lie in close proximity to the town, particularly Savernake Forest SSSI, River Kennet SSSI / CWS and Marlborough Railway Tunnel CWS and that development will protect, and where possible, enhance the ecological value of these features. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Savernake tunnel is an important bat roost and development should ensure no adverse effects on this roost.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-/?	Modest amount of new housing proposed. Both options will lead to loss of Greenfield land. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
3. Waste	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Modest levels of growth will still increase	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be

Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.16 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
management								amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues. Increased water demand generally from both options. Option 1 will allow more appropriate infrastructure to be provided in Marlborough and give better protection for the River Kennet which flows through the town and community area.	New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Kennet floodplain with regard to biodiversity issues. Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use.
5. Flood risk	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	No particular issues. Part of the town is located within Flood Zones 2&3; development could only be considered once all other options for development in Flood Zone 1 have been exhausted. The following villages also include a flood risk constraint which is currently mapped as Flood Zones 2&3: Aldbourne , Ramsbury, Avebury/Trusloe, Axford, Chilton Folliat, East Kennett, Froxfield, Fyfield, Ogbourne St George, Winterbourne Monkton and Winterbourne Bassett	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. Specific consideration of flood risk if development in proximity to River Kennet including flood risk constraints mapped as Flood Zones 2&3 in: Aldbourne, Ramsbury, Avebury/Trusloe, Axford, Chilton Folliat, East Kennett, Froxfield, Fyfield, Ogbourne St George, Winterbourne Monkton and Winterbourne Bassett.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Some traffic congestion issues in town centre. Modest level of growth likely to exacerbate any air quality issues.	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centre. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centre.
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	?	B	L	-/?	-/?	Modest level of growth. Some increase in emissions due to increased energy use and travel.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon

Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.16 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Marlborough has a high quality historic environment. Some effects likely from this modest level of development. Policy states that the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site will be protected from inappropriate development both within the site and its setting.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Marlborough is entirely within the AONB. Modest level of growth. Some adverse impacts likely depending on location and type of development proposed. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations that could have additional landscape impacts	Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on AONB. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation, particularly when there are no strategic housing allocations.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Some benefits from level of housing proposed but not significant. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Sustainable and measured growth throughout the plan period will help to deliver affordable housing in the community area and improve access to open market housing.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. The existing GP surgery in the town is at capacity and will need to expand to allow any further growth to proceed.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job	None.



Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.16 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Modest level of growth should not exert much additional pressure on existing services/facilities and may have some benefits. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	Modest level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Extra childcare facilities are needed to support working parents and there is an aspiration to merge the existing infant and junior schools in the town although extra capacity needs to cater for the long terms needs of the town .
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Modest level of growth proposed. Likely to increase need to travel and traffic volumes, particularly in town centre and through town traffic. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	A transport assessment is required for any development proposal, in particular identifying appropriate mitigation against any significant impact on transport users, local communities and the environment.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	The policy supports Marlborough's town centre to continue to function as a prominent retail centre and serve as a locally important employment centre. It also states that no further retail provision outside of Marlborough will be supported. Any additional comparison retailing should be located within the town centre of Marlborough. The town currently has a narrow economic base, catering for predominately local business needs	Future development should help to deliver early improvements to the existing infrastructure in the town. This may be achieved through direct delivery mechanisms and/or financial contributions.

Core Policy 14: Spatial Strategy: Marlborough Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.16 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
17. Employment	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	3Ha employment proposed. This has increased since June 2011 so greater benefits likely but not significant. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	Future development should help to deliver early improvements to the existing infrastructure in the town. This may be achieved through direct delivery mechanisms and/or financial contributions.

### Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.17 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. No strategic development sites. Most new development likely to be on Greenfield land with impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Specific opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the canal restoration proposals but any canal and river development must not significantly damage existing habitats.
2. Land and soil	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	--/?	Significant Greenfield development proposed. Lack of brownfield sites in Melksham. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
3. Waste management	Yes Both	LT	R	A	L	--	--/?	Proposed significant levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.17 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	options							overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--/?	Increased water demand generally from both options. High level of growth. Option 1 will allow more appropriate infrastructure to be provided in Melksham and give better protection for River Avon floodplain. Specific issues regarding proposed Melksham Link canal restoration eg flood risk, water abstraction, pollution but better addressed through policy than without.	New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Avon floodplain with regard to biodiversity issues (possibly mitigated through policies CP50 and CP67). Specific issues regarding canal link project addressed in separate policy. Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Further assessment needed for impacts of Melksham Link canal restoration.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	No specific issues at this stage as no strategic allocations. Significant level of housing on Greenfield land will increase surface water runoff. Option 2 may not provide essential infrastructure eg SuDS.	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. Specific consideration of issues if development in proximity to River Avon (possibly mitigated through policy CP67). Canal issues addressed in separate policy.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	--/?	Both options would result in growth which could adversely affect air quality and other forms of pollution. Option 2 would be more likely to result in a dispersed settlement pattern and higher overall emissions due to unmitigated travel	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centre. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centre. Mixed-use development can help reduce need to

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.17 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								patterns.	travel and therefore reduce air quality impacts.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	B	L	--	--	Both options promote significant growth which will lead to significant greenhouse gas emissions from energy use and travel. Option 1 would be more likely to promote a sustainable pattern of development, enhancing self containment but effects still likely to be significant against this objective.	Significant level of emissions will occur through energy use and travel but these can be reduced through high levels of building sustainability, onsite renewable and zero/low carbon heat and energy generation. Mixed-use development can reduce need to travel but strong consideration of sustainable transport modes necessary.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	No specific issues as no strategic allocations. This level of growth likely to lead to some adverse impacts.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	Proposals for 2040 new homes. Adverse landscape impacts likely although no specific landscape designations. Will depend on type and location.	Any development should be sensitive to the rural character of the area around Melksham. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts and identify suitable mitigation.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Residential growth in Melksham should help address the shortfall in affordable housing. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.17 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								affordable housing.	
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision which should aid in town centre regeneration in conjunction with new Melksham campus facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Increasing level of employment provision may provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--	Level of growth proposed will significantly increase traffic volumes. Town centre and A350 particularly. Town centre regeneration efforts may also increase traffic levels in centre. There are local concerns around the current opportunities to access the Melksham Oak School and new Asda store.	Development must be accompanied by investment in sustainable forms of transport that will not lead to significant increases in existing levels. Safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to town centre required. A transport assessment will be required for any major development proposal, in particular identifying appropriate mitigation against any significant impact on transport users, local communities and the environment. This should include assessing the impact of growth on the wider area, for example at Lacock.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	The level of growth proposed will have significant benefits for the local economy in	New development should have strong and accessible links to the town centre to help aid regeneration of

Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy: Melksham Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.17 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure or employment provision.	the town centre. Strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure will help reduce potential traffic congestion, particularly on A350 and in the town centre.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+	The level of growth proposed will have many benefits for the local economy in terms of providing modern accommodation for a local workforce, attracting skilled workers to the area and providing a larger customer base for local businesses. Employment allocation now reduced from 31.5-34 ha to just 6Ha therefore some benefits against this objective but not considered significant. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure or employment provision.	New development should have strong and accessible links to the town centre to help aid regeneration of the town centre. Provision of 6Ha employment land may not be sufficient to balance employment with housing growth and prevent increased out-commuting. Strong investment in sustainable transport infrastructure will help reduce potential traffic congestion, particularly on A350. Further employment growth in Melksham will help to further diversify the employment base, providing protection against possible future changes in the employment market.

## Core Policy 16: Melksham link project

Core Policy 16: Melksham link project Options 1-2 (see section 5.18 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Some impacts are likely through canal restoration in the short term particularly where there are existing assets. Longer term benefits if enhancement. River Avon – County Wildlife Site. Proposed policy more likely to offer greater protection and enhancement than having no policy.	Need for enhancement overall, not just protection. Policy states proposals must demonstrate no overall adverse effect which is welcomed. A thorough ecological survey should be undertaken prior to work. Protection of river Avon habitats essential.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No.	LT	I	A	L	0	-/?	Potential loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Not a significant issue but loss will be irreplaceable and long-term.	None.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	?	?	Policy has little or no effects against this objective.	Adequate facilities for sewage disposal and waste collection required.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	-/?	Potential for significant impacts on water resources – water quality, pollution, water abstraction. Not currently mentioned in policy text.	Including a policy will result in greater benefits. Policy text now acknowledges issues and requires thorough assessment before work takes place.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Potential flood issues associated with river Avon and Semington Brook. Long-term benefits if issues dealt with through policy rather than no policy.	All flood risk issues must be identified and resolved prior to work taking place.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective. Canals will not lead to marked reductions in air pollution caused by traffic.	None.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>8. Historic</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Potential impacts associated with town	Thorough assessment of site specific impacts

Core Policy 16: Melksham link project Options 1-2 (see section 5.18 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
environment								centre conservation area. Benefits likely if canal link brought forward through policy rather than no policy.	required prior to work taking place, including on setting of designated and non-designated assets.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	0	No particular concerns. Less impacts likely through a policy approach. There is a SLA east of Melksham Forest which may need consideration.	Restoration should respect local landscape sensitivities. New development should consider open aspect of canal route.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	0	Some residential in the form of house boats possible. More benefits with policy than without.	Establishment of facilities to cater for house boats will encourage this type of living and reduce pressure slightly for Greenfield development.
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	+	Health related benefits in terms of encouraging leisure and recreational outdoor pursuits. Increased access to the open countryside and a sustainable transport route.	None.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Benefits in terms of providing opportunities for walking and cycling over short or longer distances. Access to countryside. Mainly recreational purposes – unlikely to significantly reduce traffic volumes on Wiltshire's roads.	Potential for freight? Policy supporting text highlights sustainable transport benefits. Health related benefits from this policy could also be highlighted further in relation to walking and cycling.
16. Economy	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0	Economic benefits especially if linked with town centre regeneration. Some visitors and tourism but unlikely to be significant.	This policy must link this project with town centre regeneration. Both projects can be compatible and benefit one another.



Core Policy 16: Melksham link project Options 1-2 (see section 5.18 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
17. Employment	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0	Limited employment benefits. Some employment but unlikely to be significant.	None.

### Core Policy 17: Spatial Strategy: Mere Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>2</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.19 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

### Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area

Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.20 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. No strategic development sites. Modest level of growth. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-/?	Modest amount of new housing proposed. Some greenfield loss expected. High quality agricultural land in Pewsey Vale. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.

<sup>2</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)

Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.20 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								consideration of agricultural land quality.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Modest increase in waste through proposed growth. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Potential impacts from development on River Avon and tributaries, particularly if development taking place in Pewsey. Increased water demand generally from both options but not significant.	New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Avon. Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Further assessment needed for impacts of Melksham Link canal restoration.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	No specific issues. Provided any proposed development in this community area would be within Flood Zone 1 both now and in the future, an SFRA Level 2 would not be required.	All sources of flood risk need to be considered and appropriate surface water drainage schemes would need to be incorporated.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	No specific concerns from this level of growth.	None.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	0	No specific concerns from this level of growth.	None.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	-/?	No specific concerns from this level of growth with no strategic allocations listed. Option 2 could lead to development in unsuitable locations.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Community area within the North Wessex	Any new development should be sensitive to location

Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.20 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
urban landscapes								Downs AONB. Possible impacts from any new development. Dependant on location and type, design etc. Not considered significant due to modest level of growth.	within the AONB. Further landscape assessment may be required for all new development to assess impacts further.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+/?	Modest benefits expected. Option 2 – unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	Residential growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education contributions required.
15. Transport	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	No specific issues from this level of growth. Concerns have been expressed over increase in HGV use of A345 but this is not connected with level of housing	Any new development should provide appropriate contributions towards sustainable transport initiatives to offset related traffic increases.

Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.20 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								growth.	
16. Economy	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Modest benefits from provision of 600 new homes.	None.
17. Employment	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No strategic employment proposed. Modest benefits from provision of 600 new homes through larger available workforce but most likely to commute out of Pewsey.	None.

### Core Policy 19: Spatial Strategy: Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area

Core Policy 19: Spatial Strategy: Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.21 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	-	- / ?	No specific issues at this stage. No strategic development sites. Most new development likely to be on Greenfield land with impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Potential future benefits from restoration of the Wilts & Berks canal and Cricklade Country Way.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-	Both options will lead to loss of Greenfield land but there are brownfield sites available and much housing already allocated. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.

Core Policy 19: Spatial Strategy: Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.21 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								consideration of agricultural land quality.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues. Level of growth proposed will increase water demand overall in the long-term. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate infrastructure or in the right place.	Development will need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Identified strategic site within flood zone 1. However, loss of permeable surfaces will increase surface water runoff. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate infrastructure or in the right place.	Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required. All development should consider incorporating appropriate SuDS. Wessex Water proposals for a scheme to reduce flood risk to areas in Royal Wootton Bassett.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	No specific issues in this community area. Level of growth likely to increase traffic volumes and exacerbate any air quality issues.	Development should contribute towards bringing forward sustainable transport solutions for the town centres. If edge of town development there should be safe and convenient access to town centres.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to increase in greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.

Core Policy 19: Spatial Strategy: Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.21 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	No specific issues known. However, level of growth likely to adversely affect heritage assets in some areas. Royal Wootton Bassett, Cricklade and other settlements have important heritage designations. Option 2 may allow development in locations that damage heritage assets.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	Level of housing growth proposed will likely cause some landscape impacts depending on location and design. Coalescence concerns with Swindon in the east of the area. Potential impacts on North Wessex Downs AONB and views from it towards Royal Wootton Bassett.	Development should be avoided, where possible, where it would adversely impact on national or local landscape designations, or where it would significantly impact upon rural character. Good quality design required that reflects local character. Coalescence with Swindon should be avoided with no loss of village identity and rural character. A more detailed landscape assessment should be undertaken to assess impacts on the AONB and identify suitable mitigation.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Further work is needed to identify how improvements to the recreational facilities in the community area can be delivered. These include Ballards' Ash Sports Hub, Cricklade Country Way and the restoration of the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal.
<b>12. Poverty and</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and	None.

Core Policy 19: Spatial Strategy: Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.21 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
deprivation								employment proposed will have benefits through modern housing provision and job creation. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	
13. Community facilities	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
15. Transport	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--	Level of growth proposed will increase traffic levels generally. Over reliance on J16 M4 into Swindon and poor existing pedestrian and cycle linkages in the community area. Option 2 unlikely to ensure adequate infrastructure provision to resolve these issues.	Development should contribute to improving sustainable transport networks in the community area, especially linking town centres with development sites. Proposals exist for cycle way between Wotton Bassett and Windmill Hill Business Park, Swindon, avoiding J16 of the M4.
16. Economy	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	++	++	Both options will have significant benefits for local economy through housing growth and the level of employment proposed. This may also help provide a better level of self-containment and reduce out-commuting to Swindon.	None
17. Employment	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Good level of employment land proposed should significantly increase opportunities within the area and reduce out-commuting to other centres. Employment provision has increased from 3.7ha to 5ha since June 2011.	There is a significant level of out-commuting at present with Royal Wootton Bassett in particular acting as a dormitory town to Swindon. An increased level of employment land will increase self-containment and reduce out-commuting.

## Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy: Salisbury Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>3</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.22 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

## Core Policy 21: Maltings/Central Car Park

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.23 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance		Assessment of Effects
	Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)		
1. Social inclusion for all	+	-	The policy will provide a new and vibrant sector of the city but this will not be accessible to all due to poor public transport links in rural areas. Mixed impact.
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	0		Neutral impact
3. Improve health and well being of population	+		Provision of improved educational and cultural facilities has a positive impact on well being for those able to participate.
4. Improve safety and reduce crime	0		Neutral impact
5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities	+		The policy aims to link parts of the city to encourage walking.
6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace	+		A new park is proposed which make open space available to those living and working in the city and for visitors. Positive impact.
7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources	0		Neutral impact
8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling	0		Neutral impact
9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	+	-	The level of parking should be the minimum required for the development to function so that there is not an incentive to drive when public transport services are available. Salisbury has air quality issues and this development should not exacerbate the situation. However the development is the best location for a traffic generating use in the area of highest and densest population.

<sup>3</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)



<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	-	The level of parking should be the minimum required for the development to function so that there is not an incentive to drive when public transport services are available.
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	+	The site is previously developed land and makes best use of land in a sustainable location.
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	+	The policy requires accordance with the SFRA and redevelopment offers the opportunity to replace impervious surfaces with porous or semi-porous surfaces thereby reducing the surface water from the site. Potential for positive impact.
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	?	Unknown impact
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	+	The policy specifically refers to the need to meet requirements for phosphate levels and to use water efficiency in design.
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	+	This policy has incorporated recommendations made by the HRA; therefore, if the site is developed in accordance with this policy there will be no significant adverse effects on the River Avon SAC.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	+	The policy seeks to support and facilitate economic growth in the leisure and retail sectors.
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	+	The policy also seeks to provide an infrastructure framework which will encourage new businesses and enterprise.
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	+	Improvements are sought around the Playhouse and City Hall to make this the heart of the cultural area of Salisbury and encourage increased participation in cultural activities.
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	+	The supporting text to the policy clarifies that this centre must not undermine or compete with the existing primary and secondary shopping frontages. It is proposed that the focus should not be on retail development but a mix of retail, cultural and leisure facilities.
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	0	Neutral impact
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	0	Neutral impact

## Core Policy 22: Salisbury Skyline

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.24 main report for further details.

<b>South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)</b>
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	-	Minor negative impact - bullet point three of the policy states that only in exceptional circumstances will buildings over 12.2m be allowed in the interests of making the best use of land. This assumes that this will include extra floorspace which is generally prohibited by bullet point two.
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	0	Neutral effect

<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	+	Positive impacts - the policy seeks to protect the distinctive Salisbury skyline with its dominant cathedral spire. The tourism economy is partially built on the historic assets of the city.
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	+	Clear guidelines are given to guide development that does not undermine the historic character of the city, which could have a positive impact on this SA objective.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	+	Significant positive impact - the policy has been successfully implemented to date.

### Core Policy 23: Old Sarum airfield

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.25 main report for further details.

<b>South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)</b>
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	+	Positive impact as associated community facilities will be explored.
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	+	50% of this site should be delivered in the first five years of the life of the plan and will therefore be instrumental in meeting the housing requirement. It will be one of the sites which will have a short term positive impact on this objective rather than the longer term envisaged for other sites in the current economic climate.
<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	+	Provision of housing is related to health and well being. A contribution to a “super surgery” will be sought.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral impact - although all sites can be subject to Designing out Crime criteria.
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	+	A school will be provided on site and a district centre is planned.
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	+	The development template includes a requirement for Green Infrastructure and landscaping.
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	+	In accordance with RSS policy, 10% of energy will be generated through renewables on or near the site.
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and</b>	0	Neutral effect

<b>recycling</b>		
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	+	The site is adjacent to the Beehive park and ride and opportunities for cycle links and footpaths to Salisbury centre will be required. The site is mixed use and will provide opportunities for working and living in close proximity. Positive impact on reduction in emissions. Contributions to the Salisbury Air Quality Strategy will be required.
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	+	The site is adjacent to the Beehive park and ride and opportunities for cycle links and footpaths to Salisbury centre will be required.
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	-	The site is greenfield.
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	?	The plan requires a flood risk assessment to be carried out. Water abstraction is a recognised problem for Salisbury which will be resolved by the EA and Natural England.
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	+	Improvements to the highway network are required to prevent congestion on Castle Road.
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	?	Use of SUDs is required to manage surface water runoff. SWT capacity will be assessed.
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	+	The techniques above should preserve river quality and have no adverse impact on biodiversity. The site should be assessed for ecological value and landscaping designed to ensure that this is maintained or improved.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	+	Construction of the permitted development adjacent to the site has commenced. A master plan for this development is required which provides structural landscaping and has the potential to improve existing views to Old Sarum and screen out the park and ride site.
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	+	The site is mixed and the proposal includes 4ha of employment land within the first five years of adoption of the plan.
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	+	Infrastructure will be part of the scheme.
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	No direct impact
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	0	No direct impact
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	The proposed local facilities will not be of a scale to undermine the city centre.
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	?	Impact will be dependent on the implementation of design policies.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	?	The plan seeks enhancement of the Aerodrome conservation area. Archaeological investigation will be required. The impact on the Old Sarum SAM will have to be assessed when the detailed proposals are provided.

### Core Policy 24: Spatial Strategy: Southern Wiltshire Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>4</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.26 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

### Core Policy 25: New Forest National Park

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.27 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
1. Social inclusion for all	?	The policy only seeks that development will not have a negative effect and does not provide more explicit support for development that promotes social inclusion such as community facilities. Although it is understood that development in and adjacent to protected landscapes must be strictly controlled, this can lead to difficulties in achieving facilities which are needed by local people.
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	-	Strict control of development in National Parks leads to high house prices in and around the area and become outside the reach of local people. Whilst the policy seeks development that does not have a negative impact on the social and economic wellbeing of local communities it does not take a more positive approach to development, such as affordable housing, which would not only “not have a negative impact” but would make a positive and needed contribution to meeting the aims of this objective.
3. Improve health and well being of population	+	The Park affords opportunities for walking and cycling in a beautiful landscape, which has safe and attractive routes. Positive impact.
4. Improve safety and reduce crime	0	Neutral effect
5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities	0	Neutral effect
6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space,	-	The policy protects this important area of greenspace and will consider the impact of proposed development through extra recreation pressure which could be to the

<sup>4</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)

<b>including greenspace</b>		detriment of the Park.
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	+	Protection of the park's characteristics and environment will be positive for biodiversity.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	+	The policy directly addresses the aims of this objective.
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	+	The New Forest is part of the tourist attraction of the whole of the South Wiltshire area; therefore the policy will have positive benefits for this objective.
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	+	The New Forest is part of the tourist attraction of the whole of the South Wiltshire area; therefore the towns centres and tourist based businesses will benefit from this policy.
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	+	The policy will support the need for god quality design and construction.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	+	The policy directly addresses the aims of this objective.

## Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area

Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.28 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. Policy promotes development of ex-MOD sites and recognises possibility of impacts on Salisbury Plain SAC/SPA. Strategic development Drummond Park is a brownfield site. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. The use of brownfield land will reduce impacts on sensitive areas including the Salisbury Plain SSSI, SPA and SAC and the North Wessex Downs AONB.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	+/?	-/?	Significant amount of new housing proposed. Ex-MOD brownfield sites are promoted and if these are developed there are benefits against this objective. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of brownfield development. <b>Any development on brownfield sites should consider risks from historic contamination to ground and surface waters and remove any established risk by carrying out appropriate remediation.</b>	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss. Good opportunities in this area for brownfield remediation and development. The use of brownfield land will also reduce impacts on sensitive areas including the Salisbury Plain SSSI, SPA and SAC and the North Wessex Downs AONB.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--/?	Proposed significant levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--/?	Increased water demand generally from both options. High level of growth. Option 1 will allow more appropriate	Development should be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Development should ensure that water

Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.28 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<p>infrastructure to be provided.</p> <p>Possible constraint: Water supply issues, foul and surface water disposal and water cycle study.</p> <p>Any development on brownfield sites should consider risks from historic contamination to ground and surface waters and remove any established risk by carrying out appropriate remediation.</p>	<p>efficiency measures incorporated to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use.</p> <p>Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.</p>
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	<p>No specific issues identified with employment allocation or strategic housing allocation. There may specific issues relating to flood risk and surface water management on brownfield sites, especially at Drummond Park, which the policy could highlight. Effects dependant on location of future housing and employment.</p> <p>Greenfield development will increase surface water runoff and will need appropriate mitigation.</p>	<p>Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required.</p> <p>There may specific issues relating to flood risk and surface water management on brownfield sites, especially at Drummond Park, which the policy could highlight.</p>
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	<p>Level of proposed growth likely to increase emissions to air, noise and light pollution.</p> <p>No specific issues identified through strategic allocation and employment allocation.</p> <p>Policy recognises need for traffic demand management and containment solutions to limit the impact of new development on the A303 with other improvements including enhanced public transport connectivity, including a local bus service in Tidworth.</p>	<p>Focussing development in or near to town centres can reduce need to travel and allow improvements to public transport services. Policy requires 'transport assessment for any development proposal, in particular identifying appropriate mitigation against any significant impact on transport users, local communities and the environment'.</p>
<b>7. Climatic</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	--	--	Both policy options promote significant	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient,



Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.28 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>factors</b>								growth and will lead to significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel.	reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	?	-	No specific issues known. However, level of growth likely to adversely affect heritage assets in some areas. Option 2 may allow development in locations that damage heritage assets.	Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--/?	Part of community area within North Wessex Downs AONB. Some adverse effects from development depending on location and type. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations that adversely affect the AONB.	Development should be sensitive to the setting of the AONB. The use of brownfield land will reduce impacts on sensitive areas including the Salisbury Plain SSSI, SPA and SAC and the AONB.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	Significant benefits from level of housing proposed. 'Super garrison' status will affect housing need and it is important that housing proposed can meet this need. Option 2 – high level of housing but unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community and the needs of an expanding military population.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits for health and wellbeing through modern housing provision and job creation. Expanding military population will lead to additional infrastructure needs. Option 2 unlikely to meet community needs for infrastructure and affordable housing.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Infrastructure needs to provide for specialist needs of expanding military population.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	No specific issues. Level of housing and employment proposed will have benefits	None.

Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.28 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								through modern housing provision and job creation. Expanding military population will lead to additional infrastructure needs. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or infrastructure provision.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits through community infrastructure provision from Option 1. Expanding military population will lead to additional infrastructure needs. Option 2 provides no certainty of infrastructure provision.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision. Infrastructure needs to provide for specialist needs of expanding military population.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Level of employment provision will enable local businesses to expand and retain/attract skilled workers. Expanding military population will lead to additional infrastructure needs. Option 2 provides no certainty of employment or educational infrastructure provision.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers. Infrastructure needs to provide for specialist needs of expanding military population.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--	Level of proposed housing likely to significantly increase traffic volumes. Public transport connectivity is not good currently.	Policy requires proposals to carry out a transport assessment, identifying appropriate mitigation against any significant impact on transport users, local communities and the environment. Traffic demand management and containment solutions will be needed to limit the impact of new development on the A303. Other improvements should include enhanced public transport connectivity, including a local bus service in Tidworth, and improved rights of way and cycling links between Tidworth and Ludgershall.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Both	LT	R	A	L	++	++	Significant level of housing and employment proposed. 12Ha employment	Super garrison will lead to additional infrastructure needs in the community area which must be met to

Core Policy 26: Spatial Strategy: Tidworth Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.28 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	options							at Land north of Tidworth rd and Castledown has capacity. Increase in military population may increase economic opportunities.	enable economic growth locally. Further improvements to the retail offer of Tidworth and Ludgershall is a priority. Regeneration of the town centres is particularly important. It is important that any additional retail provision is directed to town centres to help improve the retail offer and vitality and viability.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	++	++	Significant level of housing and employment proposed. 12Ha employment at Land north of Tidworth rd and Castledown has capacity. Increase in military population may increase economic opportunities.	None. Good level of employment provision. Capacity at Castledown.

### Core Policy 27: Spatial Strategy: Tisbury Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>5</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.29 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

<sup>5</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)

## Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	?	As Option 1 will deliver a planned approach to Trowbridge town centre this is more likely to deliver environmental enhancement – the emerging master plan includes proposals for improving the River Biss corridor which could incorporate benefits to biodiversity. The effects of Option 2 are more uncertain, however as this approach will be determined by the market, it is likely that development will only occur on commercially viable sites and so any wider environmental benefits are likely to be more difficult to deliver.	Development should be promoted in appropriate locations where adverse effects are minimised – master planning will contribute to this approach with development opportunities being supported by evidence. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Complimentary Core Strategy policies implemented via planning conditions, should encourage mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity interests through the planning process.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes	LT	R	A	L	++	+/?	Option 1 supports the delivery of a master plan for regenerating the town centre of Trowbridge and is focused on the redevelopment of brown field land. The effects of Option 2 are uncertain as no specific proposals have been made. However, Option 2 is still likely to result in some redevelopment of brown field land due to the number of development opportunities that exist in the centre of Trowbridge.	Policy focuses development on brownfield sites. Sites of particular ecological quality will require specific consideration to avoid impacts.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	?	?	The likely effects for both options are uncertain without more specific details of development	Complimentary Core Strategy policies should encourage a sustainable approach to waste

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								proposals. However, any development coming forward through either option would still need to comply with national and Core Strategy policy, thus presenting an opportunity for sustainable waste management.	management. Management of waste stream and recycling initiatives and facilities present some opportunities for mitigation.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0/?	Effects will depend on the location and type of any development proposed, proximity to watercourse etc. However proposals give substantial opportunities for enhancement of the River Biss. Discussions with infrastructure providers indicate that capacity issues can be suitably managed for the level of growth proposed.	Development will be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies, delivered through planning conditions, should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water and use SUDS when appropriate.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Although specific effects cannot be established without details for specific development proposals, the master planning approach (Option 1) is more likely to provide opportunities for enhancement as a strategy can more easily be developed for the town centre area as a whole, with appropriate development directed to suitable sites. Any development brought forward by the market (Option 2) would still need to comply with national policy, but may not provide the best approach to deliver wider enhancement. The Level 1 SFRA	A Surface Water Management Study has been prepared for Trowbridge and the recommendations from this work will need to be incorporated into any town centre master plan. Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will still be required where appropriate and mitigation including flood storage and appropriate design (including architectural layout and SUDS) can reduce flooding risk both on and off site.

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								suggests that flooding issues are capable of mitigation through correct design and siting for any development.	
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	I	A	L	+	-/?	Some of the objectives for the Trowbridge town centre master plan (Option 1) are to deliver an enhanced public transport interchange, improved railway station, improved pedestrian and cycle linkages across the central area of the town and an enhanced river corridor providing further sustainable routes – these will help to reduce traffic, congestion and pollution. A master planning approach will also allow appropriate development to be directed to the most suitable sites. The effects of Option 2 are more uncertain, but an unplanned approach to developing Trowbridge is less likely to deliver wider benefits and may result in less suitable development coming forward on some sites.	Additional Core Strategy policies should promote sustainable transport and other means to cut pollution, including demand management.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	I	B	L	+/?	-/?	Any growth is likely to lead to increases in emissions, although these will be partly mitigated through national and Core Strategy policy. A planned approach to growth (Option 1) is more likely to provide opportunities for enhancement and can contribute to suitable development being located where it can be connected to a proposed district energy network – which would significantly reduce emissions. An unplanned approach (Option 2) is less likely to deliver opportunities for	National and Core Strategy policy can facilitate mitigation to some extent through energy efficiency, use of renewable energy and low/zero carbon energy sources, investment in sustainable transport solutions, urban layout and suitable planting and landscaping.

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								enhancement and may result in development patterns which do not allow the establishment of a district energy network.	
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	The likely effects for both options are uncertain without more specific details of development proposals. However, as there are a large number of brownfield development opportunity sites in Trowbridge, both options present some opportunity for enhancement of the wider public realm.	Supporting development management policies and SPDs can mitigate negative effects and bring about improvements. Development of key urban sites should be carefully controlled and heritage interests secured through planning conditions.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	Option 1 directs growth to a range of brownfield sites in the central area of Trowbridge and provides an opportunity for enhancement. The effects of Option 2 are uncertain but an unplanned approach may be less likely to deliver enhancement.	The Trowbridge town centre master plan should include design guidance and promote high quality and sustainable development. Core Strategy policies should promote good quality design and afford protection to historic assets.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	The focus for the Trowbridge town centre master plan is to deliver retail, leisure, service, and employment uses, with some housing located appropriately in the central area of Trowbridge. This approach (Option 1) is more likely to ensure appropriate development is located in suitable locations – although this may not contribute significantly to housing provision. The effects of the market approach (Option 2) are more uncertain without specific proposals coming forward.	Core Strategy policies will promote the provision of affordable housing, high quality design and an appropriate mix of tenures, property types and sizes.
<b>11. Healthy</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	A planned approach (Option 1) to the	The Trowbridge town centre master plan

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
communities								regeneration of Trowbridge is more likely to lead to positive effects overall, with appropriate development directed to suitable locations and the creation of viable urban communities. Enhanced pedestrian linkages and high quality design can reduce crime and the fear of crime and increase sustainable modes of travel. The effects of Option 2 are more uncertain without specific proposals.	should include design guidance and promote high quality and sustainable development contributing to the creation of viable and sustainable communities. Core Strategy policies should promote good quality design which enables the creation of sustainable communities.
12. Poverty and deprivation	Yes	MT	R	A	L	++	-/?	Trowbridge contains some deprived areas and focusing investment to the town is likely to have a positive effect over time, particularly with the delivery of improved facilities and services. Market forces are more likely to 'cherry pick', delivering the most attractive development opportunities and this may result in less overall enhancement or positive impacts than for Option 1.	None
13. Community facilities	Yes	MT	R	A	L	++	-	The Trowbridge town centre master plan is specifically designed to facilitate the regeneration of Trowbridge, and together with the wider strategy for Trowbridge, deliver significant enhancement to infrastructure. A key opportunity within Option 1 is to deliver enhanced leisure facilities in the heart of Trowbridge. As outlined above, the unplanned approach may result in 'cherry picking' of development sites with the risk that development may not occur on the most	None for option 1. Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong policies requiring higher development contributions.



Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								appropriate sites – and would be less likely to deliver the same enhancement in provision of facilities.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	0	There are no specific proposals within the Trowbridge town centre master plan for enhancement to the provision of education related infrastructure, but it will lead to new jobs and skills retention. Development from either option would contribute to wider infrastructure provision, although this may not be specifically related to the education sector.	The enhancement of educational/ skills training facilities should be delivered through the wider strategy for Trowbridge.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Master planning (Option 1) presents an opportunity to deliver enhancement to Trowbridge overall and ensure appropriate development is directed to suitable locations. The Trowbridge town centre master plan proposes a number of enhancements (see 6. Air Quality). An unplanned approach may result in more negative impacts on the transport network requiring stronger mitigation.	Additional Core Strategy policies should promote sustainable transport and other means to cut pollution, including demand management. The Trowbridge town centre master plan should include detailed proposals for improving public transport integration and reducing the need to travel by less sustainable modes of travel. Strong mitigation would be required for any development where negative impacts were likely including the use of demand management.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	++	-	A master planning approach (Option 1) to regenerating Trowbridge town centre is likely to deliver a positive effect on the local economy, particularly through providing enhanced retail, leisure, and service and employment provision.	The Trowbridge town centre master plan should include detailed proposals for strengthening the economy of Trowbridge with an evidenced based and planned approach to future town centre uses.

Core Policy 28: Trowbridge Central Areas of Opportunity									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.30 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<p>The overall enhancement of Trowbridge centre will also make the town more popular for visitors and companies alike. Market forces (Option 2) may not deliver the same level of enhancement and regeneration and uses could be promoted which cause damage to the existing town centre. For example, further convenience food retailing on the periphery of the central area of the town is likely to cause further damage to the existing retail offer.</p>	<p>Additional Core Strategy policies should promote appropriate uses in the central area of Trowbridge and help to avoid inappropriate development.</p>
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	++	-/?	<p>Option 1 proposes the provision of employment as part of town centre regeneration and is likely to lead to a positive effect and job creation. The effects of option 2 are more uncertain as the market may not deliver development resulting in increased employment provision.</p>	<p>The Trowbridge town centre master plan should include detailed proposals for providing employment provision with an evidenced based and planned approach to future town centre uses. Additional Core Strategy policies should promote appropriate uses in the central area of Trowbridge and help to avoid inappropriate development.</p>

## Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 2	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-- /?	Urban extension: specific issues with River Biss and ancient woodland. Mitigation possible on this large site. Biodiversity protection and enhancement required across site. Ancient woodland sites to the south-east support a breeding population of Bechstein's bats. There is evidence these are part of population which uses the Bath and Bradford-on-Avon Bats SAC; all development will need to protect and enhance these sites and ensure no significant effect on integrity of SAC. Development of brownfield sites – it should be noted that brownfield sites can be important habitats (in some cases a UK BAP priority habitat – Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land), and in these situations, reuse should not necessarily be maximised.	Specific mitigation measures required for River Biss corridor and ancient woodland areas that support Bechstein's bats. Urban extension – enhancement of biodiversity through significant GI provision, appropriate protection of River Biss corridor with adequate buffer. All mitigation considered and enacted to protect breeding and foraging sites of bats, including enhancement of ancient woodland sites and management of likely increased recreational pressures.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	--/?	Significant amount of new housing proposed. Both options will lead to significant loss of Greenfield land. Limited brownfield sites available for this level of growth. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss. Locating development on the edge of existing urban area with good transport links to town centre will improve the sustainability of the option.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	C	L	-	--/?	Proposed significant levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	--	--/?	Significant level of development proposed will	Specific measures needed to prevent adverse

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
resources	Both options							significantly increase water demand. Specific issues regarding development in proximity to River Biss. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate water infrastructure or in the right place, and may not offer appropriate protection and enhancement of the Biss corridor, including water quality and biodiversity interests.	impacts on River Biss. Development will be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within the sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water and use SUDS where appropriate.
5. Flood risk	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-/?	--/?	Significant areas of flood risk associated with River Biss. Flood zones 2 and 3 can be avoided therefore not considered significant. The development on an urban extension provides an opportunity to deliver a flood attenuation lake, thus reducing existing flood risk to Trowbridge in addition to ensuring any new development is not vulnerable to flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. The impacts of Option 2 are more uncertain, but as development is more likely to be dispersed, this would be less likely to deliver wider flood attenuation benefits to Trowbridge overall.	Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will be required where appropriate. Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	Yes Option 2	LT	R	C	L	-/?	--/?	The level of growth proposed could adversely affect air quality and other forms of pollution. Traffic likely to be the key issue. Option 1 is designed, in part, to deliver	Most growth proposed for Trowbridge and the key issue is traffic and travel. Growth on the scale proposed must be accompanied by significant transport infrastructure that promotes and

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<p>improvements to the existing strategic transport network, thus reducing traffic congestion and helping to reduce pollution. Proposed new secondary school would reduce cross town journeys. The development will also deliver pedestrian and cycle linkages along the River Biss to the town centre and include strong sustainable transport connectivity.</p> <p>The impacts of Option 2 are more uncertain as the specific location of development is unknown. This is likely to result in more dispersed development; it would be more difficult to deliver enhancements and would be more difficult to deliver public transport provision.</p>	<p>encourages sustainable forms of travel. Links with the town centre must be safe and convenient. A mixed-use development can reduce need to travel, especially through school, retail and employment provision, but must not prevent town centre regeneration.</p> <p>Strategic growth at south-east Trowbridge will need to facilitate delivery of strategic improvements to the A350, particularly at Yarnbrook and West Ashton where existing junction arrangements are over capacity. This is currently a source of traffic congestion.</p>
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	B	L	--	--	<p>Both options promote significant growth which will lead to significant greenhouse gas emissions from energy use and travel. Option 1 more likely to promote a sustainable pattern of development through one urban extension, enhancing self containment but effects still likely to be significant against this objective.</p>	<p>Significant level of emissions will occur through energy use and travel but these can be reduced through high levels of building sustainability, onsite renewable and zero/low carbon heat and energy generation.</p> <p>Mixed-use development can reduce need to travel but strong consideration of sustainable transport modes necessary.</p>
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	<p>No specific issues identified through growth at south-east Trowbridge but clarification needed through further assessment. Greenfield development – may be archaeological impacts.</p>	<p>Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts.</p> <p>Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.</p>
<b>9. Rural and</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	<p>As Option 1 proposes a large strategic</p>	<p>Further detailed landscape assessments are</p>

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
urban landscapes								development site to the south east of Trowbridge which is located entirely on greenfield land, this will have some impact on the rural landscape. However, the area is not protected with any statutory designations for landscape quality, and has been selected to avoid other designated areas in proximity to Trowbridge being chosen for development, including the Western Wiltshire Greenbelt, which precludes any development to the north and north west. The proposal also incorporates large areas of green space and a green corridor along the River Biss. Option 2 is likely to lead to more dispersed development; this could have a greater adverse impact and may also offer more restricted opportunities for mitigation.	required to ensure the master plan approach to the proposed strategic site incorporates appropriate mitigation. Detailed landscape assessments would be required for any other sites coming forward and other Core Strategy policies, along with national policy, will ensure any designated areas are protected.
10. Housing	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	The proposed policy (Option 1) would deliver housing growth to meet local need, facilitating the delivery of affordable housing to address local demand and support job creation. As Option 2 does not include specific development sites the impact is more uncertain. Likely that if unchecked, the market would deliver more housing than proposed in Option 1, which could lead to an increase in the likely negative effects identified for the other sustainability criteria.	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Any development will be required to contribute to appropriate infrastructure provision. However, locating development in the form of an urban extension (Option 1) is more likely to deliver new services and facilities which best compliment existing services – i.e. serve a new community and be highly accessible. Option 1 would also deliver strong pedestrian and cycle linkages with the town centre via a green corridor along the River Biss. An urban extension would be easier to connect to public transport than dispersed development which would be likely to result from Option 2.	Provision of strong public transport linkages, pedestrian and cycle routes to Trowbridge town centre (via a green corridor along the River Biss) and high quality design will need to be incorporated into the master planning of the proposed strategic site. Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Strong Core Strategy policies are needed to ensure any other development meets high quality design and sustainability standards.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	C	L	++	-	The development of strategic growth in Trowbridge will deliver a number of key infrastructure projects, employment growth and also contribute to both the delivery of improved services and facilities, but also increasing the critical mass of the settlement to improve the viability of improved retail and leisure/ entertainment facilities. This will have a beneficial impact on poverty levels in Trowbridge overall. Leaving the level of growth and its location to the market may deliver some improvements, but this will be more uncertain and more difficult to control. Delivering joined up improvements to Trowbridge would be likely to be less	None.

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								successful through Option 2.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-	As discussed above, the proposed strategic growth (Option 1) is designed to deliver significant infrastructure improvements (including to the strategic transport network) and contribute to improved services and facilities in the settlement overall. The level of growth delivered as a result of Option 2 is uncertain, and any benefits to infrastructure would also be uncertain and more difficult to plan for.	High level of growth must be matched by appropriate community infrastructure provision.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-/?	Option 1 will deliver a new secondary school to the south east of Trowbridge which will serve the proposed urban extension and other planned and recent growth to the east of the settlement. This will enhance secondary education provision in Trowbridge along with providing two new primary schools. Option 2 may deliver more dispersed growth which would be more difficult to provide new school provision for without increasing the need to travel. As the level of growth within Option 2 would be uncertain this would also make planning for the future education needs of Trowbridge more difficult.	Appropriate level of education infrastructure required. Level of employment provision may need to be increased to provide greater opportunities for local businesses to retain and attract skilled workers.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--	Level of growth proposed is likely to increase private car use generally, despite any investment in sustainable transport	It is important that master planning for the proposed urban extension delivers those matters listed in the policy and outlined by the SA.



Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<p>infrastructure. However, Option 1 will deliver improvements to the strategic transport network, particularly to the A350 around Yarnbrook and West Ashton which is an existing source of congestion. The proposed urban extension can also be connected to Trowbridge through a green corridor along the River Biss and provide strong public transport linkages. Focusing development in one urban extension maximises the opportunity to deliver enhancement overall. Market led growth is more uncertain, is less likely to deliver the same level of enhancement and if it resulted in more dispersed growth, this would be more difficult to connect to sustainable forms of transport.</p>	<p>Additional Core Strategy policies should promote sustainable transport and other means to cut pollution, including demand management. Development proposals should carefully consider schemes to significantly reduce private car use. Strong investment required to improve public transport services and walking/cycling links, particularly with the town centre. Mixed-use development will help increase self-containment and reduce need to travel. Further traffic modelling required, in particular to gauge effects on Trowbridge town centre and on A350. Significant new highways infrastructure will be very expensive and may restrict other infrastructure provision.</p>
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	<p>Option 1 as proposed will deliver a significant amount of new employment land in Trowbridge and effective phasing can be used to ensure that new employment is delivered alongside housing. Significant infrastructure improvements to the settlement will also make Trowbridge more attractive to visitors and prospective employers alike. The impacts of Option 2 are more uncertain. However, the market is less likely to deliver the same level of balanced job growth. As the level of growth would be uncertain, planning for future</p>	<p>Master planning for the proposed strategic site should include detailed proposals for providing employment provision and make appropriate provision for phasing so employment and housing is delivered in a balanced and sustainable way. Mitigation options for Option 2 are more restricted.</p>

Core Policy 29: Spatial Strategy: Trowbridge Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.31 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								infrastructure provision would be more difficult.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	As significant employment growth will be delivered alongside housing and infrastructure enhancement, Option 1 will have a likely significant positive effect. Option 2 is less likely to deliver balanced job creation and the market is more likely to focus on housing growth where viable sites are identified.	Employment land provision has been reduced from 30ha to 25ha since June 2011 however significant benefits still anticipated against this objective.

### Core Policy 30: Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network

Core Policy 30: Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network Options 1-3 (see section 5.32 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Uncertain.	MT	R	A	L	0/?	0/?	0	Few impacts in town centre. Precise area(s) not known. Possible impacts on River Biss? Option 3 no impacts.	Consideration of protecting and enhancing biodiversity required within areas covered by this scheme. Further details of area(s) concerned required.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	0	Any development small scale and in town centre. Brownfield sites promoted.	Development should be located on brownfield sites wherever possible.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No impacts.	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	No specific issues.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	0	Details of areas under consideration not known. Possible impacts on River Biss? Option 2 – development would occur at a later stage – may allow more time to	Development would need to be assessed for impacts on ground and surface water. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses.

Core Policy 30: Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network Options 1-3 (see section 5.32 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									consider impact mitigation. Option 3 no impacts.	
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	0	Some potential impacts Options 1 and 2. Would depend on location and nature of development.	Development should avoid areas of flood risk. Brownfield land preferable. Further details of area(s) under consideration and nature of development required.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Option 1 and 2	LT	R	A	L	++	++	-	The nature of the proposals will likely improve air quality and significantly reduce Wiltshire's impacts on climate change.	To reduce impacts on air quality and climate further, a far more radical approach is needed with policies for district energy/ heat networks right across Wiltshire, including policies for renewable energy, energy efficiency in all new and existing buildings and significant investment in sustainable transport networks.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	-	The nature of the proposals will likely reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce our impacts on climate change somewhat. However proposals will not significantly address Wiltshire's contribution to global climate change.	To significantly reduce impacts on air quality and climate, a far more radical approach is needed with policies for district energy/ heat networks right across Wiltshire, including policies for renewable energy, energy efficiency in all new and existing buildings and significant investment in sustainable transport networks.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	0	Proposals may adversely impact on some historic assets within Trowbridge town centre. Effects will depend on location, design and mitigation.	Proposals should avoid adversely affecting any heritage assets within Trowbridge town centre.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+/?	+/?	0	Options 1 and 2 will allow limited improvements in air quality and may	None

Core Policy 30: Trowbridge Low-Carbon/ Renewable Energy Network Options 1-3 (see section 5.32 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									reduce energy bills locally for some residents and businesses.	
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
16. Economy	No	MT	R	B	L	+/?	+/?	0	Options 1 and 2 will allow limited improvements in air quality and may reduce energy bills.	None
17. Employment	No	MT	R	B	L	+/?	+/?	0	Options 1 and 2 will allow limited improvements in air quality and may reduce energy bills.	None

### Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	-- / ?	Strategic housing site entirely Greenfield land with potential impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. There are known issues concerning phosphate levels within the River Avon SAC. Discussions are being held to resolve these and a Nutrient Management Plan is being	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible. All development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								developed by NE/EA. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors and may not provide mitigation for River Avon SAC.	enhance biodiversity wherever possible. River Avon phosphates issue to be resolved through consultation with Environment Agency and Natural England. A Nutrient Management Plan is currently being developed.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options	LT	I	A	L	--	--/?	Significant amount of new housing proposed. Both options will lead to significant loss of Greenfield land. Limited brownfield sites available for this level of growth. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	A	L	-	--/?	Proposed significant levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place and this could be significant.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	B	L	--	--/?	Discussions with infrastructure providers indicate that capacity issues can be suitably managed for the level of growth proposed, but significant increase in water demand. The proposed urban extension within Option 1 is within a groundwater protection zone and suitable mitigation is required. Phosphate discharge from Warminster Sewage Treatment works is elevated and an appropriate solution is needed. However, opportunities to address this issue are much more achievable with development located on a strategic urban extension. It may	Development will be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within the sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water and use SUDS where appropriate. Contributions may be needed to a Nutrient Management Plan. Development should not

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								not be viable for suitable mitigation to be delivered on smaller and more dispersed development sites as onsite sewage treatment may be necessary.	proceed until suitable mitigation is provided that ensures that development does not harm integrity of the River Avon SAC – this approach may only be achievable for Option 1.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--/?	The proposed strategic site area includes some floodplain. However, any built development could avoid Flood Zones 2 or 3. Surface water runoff is a problem with limited storm drainage capacity in Warminster and focusing development on an urban extension (Option 1) provides an opportunity to reduce the existing flood risk to the town by upgrading the existing drainage network. The impacts of Option 2 are more uncertain, but as development is more likely to be dispersed, this would be less likely to deliver wider flood attenuation benefits to Warminster overall.	Master planning for the proposed urban extension will need to include appropriate mitigation for surface water management – in Warminster this will require appropriate modification and improvement to the existing storm drainage network. EA have informed that an SFRA Level 2 is required for Warminster. Parts of the strategic sites allocated for housing appear to lie within Flood Zones 2/3. The SFRA Level 2 should inform an overarching strategy for the management of flood risk, particularly with respect to surface water drainage.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Option 2	MT	R	B	L	-/?	--/?	This level of growth will lead to increased traffic volumes and an increase air quality issues. However, focusing growth at an urban extension provides the greatest opportunity to connect new development with public transport. The proposal (Option 1) requires a sustainable transport strategy to ensure pupils can attend Kingdown school without increasing car use and provide a highway link between the A3414 and A362 to	All development, and the urban extension in particular, should be accompanied by significant and innovative sustainable transport solutions to mitigate the level of additional vehicle use that could result from this scale of growth. There is no information on the sustainable transport strategy for Kingdown school and other strategies need consideration to avoid a significant effect.

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								avoid negative impacts on West Street. As the site is well connected to the strategic highway network, this will also help alleviate the need for traffic to travel through Warminster itself. These approaches will help limit pollution from road traffic. As the scale and location of growth in Option 2 are uncertain, the impacts are unknown. If growth was more dispersed this would be more difficult to serve by public transport.	
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	I	B	L	-	--/?	Any growth is likely to lead to increases in emissions, although these will be partly mitigated through national and Core Strategy policy. Focusing development in the form of an urban extension significantly increases the opportunity to deliver decentralised/ low carbon or renewable energy, which may be more difficult on dispersed sites. Option 2 may result in a more dispersed pattern of development where the level of onsite renewable may not be achieved.	Significant level of emissions will occur through energy use and travel but these can be reduced through high levels of building sustainability, onsite renewable and zero/low carbon heat and energy generation. The urban extension must deliver significant onsite renewable energy provision to offset likely effects. Mixed-use development can reduce need to travel but strong consideration of sustainable transport modes necessary.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	No specific issues. Further archaeological assessment needed for urban extension to clarify effects further. Most development to be focused on greenfield land. Potential effects on historic town centre and landscape impacts re AONB/Cley Hill from urban extension to the west of the town – effects	Master planning for the proposed strategic site should include high quality design proposals which complement the existing built form of Warminster and do not cause any negative impact on the historic character of the town. Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								dependant on location and type of development. The effects of Option 2 are uncertain as the location of development is unknown.	setting to avoid/reduce impacts. Appropriate archaeological assessment prior to any development required.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--	Significant effects on the AONB and SLA to the west likely, including Cley Hill. These designations are within 0.5km of urban extension. Views across site from Cley hill and other points. Strong consideration of mitigating impacts. The policy requires the views and setting of the AONB to be protected and should also include large areas of green space. Option 2 likely to lead to more dispersed development, any impact is more uncertain, but may offer more restricted opportunities for mitigation.	Further detailed landscape assessments are required to ensure the master planning approach to the proposed strategic site incorporates appropriate mitigation. Appropriate screening and protection of the setting and views of the AONB are required. Detailed landscape assessments would be required for any other sites coming forward and other Core Strategy policies, along with National Policy, will ensure any designated areas are protected.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+/?	The proposed policy (Option 1) would deliver housing growth to meet local need, facilitating the delivery of affordable housing to address local demand and support job creation by ensuring there is an adequate supply of housing for employees of companies moving to the area. Option 2 does not include specific development sites; the impact is more uncertain. However, it is likely that if	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion issues to be addressed.



Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								unchecked, the market would deliver more housing than proposed in Option 1, which could lead to an increase in the likely negative effects identified for the other sustainability criteria.	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Any development will be required to contribute to appropriate infrastructure provision. However, locating development in the form of an urban extension (Option 1) is more likely to deliver new services and facilities which best compliment existing services – i.e. serve a new community and be highly accessible. An urban extension would be easier to connect to public transport than dispersed development which would be likely to result from Option 2.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-/?	The development of strategic growth in Warminster will deliver employment growth and also contribute to both the delivery of improved services and facilities, but also increasing the critical mass of the settlement to improve the viability of improved retail and leisure/ entertainment facilities. This will have a beneficial impact on Warminster overall. Leaving the level of growth and its location to the market may deliver some improvements, but this will be more uncertain and more difficult to control.	None

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-/?	As discussed above, the proposed strategic growth (Option 1) is designed to contribute to improved services and facilities in the settlement overall. The level of growth delivered as a result of Option 2 is uncertain, and any benefits to infrastructure would also be uncertain and more difficult to plan for.	None for option 1. Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong policies requiring higher development contributions.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	?	Both options would contribute to additional education provision, although if the level of growth was uncertain (Option 2) this would be more difficult to plan for. The scale of growth proposed in Option 1 is not sufficient to provide any new schools in Warminster, but would contribute to expansion of existing facilities.	None for option 1. Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong policies requiring higher development contributions.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	A	L	--	--	Level of growth proposed will significantly increase traffic volumes. Town centre and A36 particularly. Policy states 'a sustainable transport solution for pupils attending Kingdown Secondary School is required'. There is no further information regarding this and this will not mitigate for likely increased travel need from this development for other purposes. Further information needed on significant and innovative sustainable transport solutions.	All development and the urban extension in particular, should be accompanied by significant and innovative sustainable transport solutions to mitigate the level of additional vehicle use that could result from this scale of growth. There is no information on the sustainable transport strategy for Kingdown school and other strategies are needed to avoid a significant effect. Safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to town centre required. A transport assessment will be required for any development proposal, in particular identifying

Core Policy 31: Spatial Strategy: Warminster Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.33 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									appropriate mitigation against any significant impact on transport users, local communities and the environment.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Option 1 as proposed will deliver a significant amount of new employment land in Warminster and effective phasing can be used to ensure that new employment is delivered alongside housing. Increasing the critical mass of the town and helping deliver enhanced retail and services will also make Warminster more attractive to visitors and prospective employers alike. The impacts of Option 2 are more uncertain. However, the market is less likely to deliver the same level of balanced job growth. As the level of growth would be uncertain, planning for future infrastructure provision would be more difficult.	Master planning for the proposed strategic site should include detailed proposals for providing employment provision and make appropriate provision for phasing so employment and housing is delivered in a balanced and sustainable way. Mitigation options for Option 2 are more restricted.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	C	L	++	+	As significant employment growth will be delivered alongside housing, Option 1 will have a likely significant positive effect. Option 2 is less likely to deliver balanced job creation and the market is more likely to focus on housing growth where viable sites are identified.	Identifying suitable growth for both housing and employment in the Core Strategy would help alleviate the adverse impacts associated with Option 2.

## Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area

Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	No specific issues at this stage. Some new development likely to be on greenfield land with impacts including species disturbance and habitat fragmentation. Employment site at Hawkeridge lies within 600m of an area of ancient woodland. Option 2 may result in less sustainable development locations that impact on sensitive environmental receptors.	Development should avoid impacts on sensitive receptors such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland, and enhance biodiversity wherever possible. Specific measures to reduce disturbance at
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Both options.	LT	I	A	L	--	--/?	Significant amount of new housing/ employment proposed. Both options will lead to significant loss of Greenfield land. Limited brownfield sites available for level of growth proposed, especially employment. Option 2 may lead to development in less sustainable locations with less consideration of agricultural land quality.	Consideration should be given to avoiding higher quality agricultural land and building at maximum viable densities to avoid Greenfield loss.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Proposed levels of growth will increase amounts of waste produced overall. Option 2 may not bring forward adequate waste infrastructure or in the right place.	Appropriate levels of waste infrastructure should be provided, including recycling facilities in convenient locations. Development should be designed to reduce waste during construction and operational phases.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-/?	Increase in water demand overall. No major watercourses in proximity to proposed employment site at Mill lane. Option 2 unlikely to provide adequate infrastructure and protection.	Any development will need to be assessed for impacts on groundwater and sufficient capacity within sewerage network. Additional policies should ensure that development incorporates measures to increase water efficiency in the home and reduce water use. Development should be located to avoid possible pollution to watercourses and have appropriate

Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									infrastructure in place to deal with foul and surface water.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	No specific concerns at this stage. Mill lane employment site – significant loss of Greenfield land with increase in impermeable surfaces. Area of flood zones 2 and 3 to the east assoc with Bitham brook can be avoided.	Consideration of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. If considering FZ2/3 an SFRA Level 2 will be required.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes Both options	LT	R	B	L	--	--	Level of growth likely to exacerbate air quality issues. AQMA is designated in town centre and no solutions have been put forward. Hawkeridge proposal – rural location, likely air, noise, light impacts. Out-of-town location will encourage road usage. Option 1 does provide support for some of the remaining housing requirement to be delivered on a new strategic allocation at Station Road, which would deliver a new rail crossing and alleviate traffic flows on Oldfield Road. It could also deliver improved access to the station, including for public transport. Impacts of Option 2 are uncertain, however as the scale of growth is likely to be higher, this could result in more adverse impacts.	All new development must not exacerbate air quality issues in Westbury. Level of growth will ultimately increase road traffic. Hawkeridge site – can access be provided to A350 without vehicles travelling through town centre ie new road access east to A350? Possible consideration.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	Both policy options promote growth and will lead to increase in greenhouse gas emissions through energy use and travel.	All new buildings should be highly energy efficient, reducing energy use and incorporating renewables onsite where possible. Use of zero/low carbon energy sources for energy/heat generation. Developments that reduce need to

Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									travel should be favoured over others.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	No specific issues. Development at Hawkeridge will result in loss of significant area Greenfield land. Potential archaeological effects. Option 1 supports enhancement to PDL, particularly at Station Road, which could deliver an enhanced gateway to the town. This option also promotes town centre enhancement with high quality development which complements the historic character of the town. The scale of growth in Option 2 is likely to be higher than for Option 1 and the location of development is uncertain.	Further archaeological assessment at Hawkeridge and potential impacts on listed building at Hawkeridge Farm. Consideration of impacts of new development near/in the town centre historic core. Strong consideration of any designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting to avoid/reduce impacts.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	Proposed strategic employment site at Hawkeridge located on greenfield and agricultural land in a rural area and so could result in some adverse impacts. No landscape designations in that area however. Impacts for Option 2 are uncertain, but as the scale of growth is likely to be higher there is greater risk of more greenfield land being needed.	Further detailed landscape assessment required for proposed Greenfield sites. Development near/in town centre must respect the setting of the historic centre through appropriate design standards.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	The proposed policy (Option 1) would deliver housing growth to meet local need, facilitating the delivery of affordable housing to address local demand and support job creation Option 2 - likely that if unchecked, the market would deliver more housing than proposed in	Appropriate provision of affordable dwellings and type/tenure to meet needs of community. Residential should be phased throughout the plan period to enable infrastructure and traffic congestion/air quality issues to be addressed.

Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								Option 1, which could lead to an increase in the likely negative effects identified for the other sustainability criteria.	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	Any development will be required to contribute to appropriate infrastructure provision. Excellent level of employment provision. Residential development in Option 1 is likely to be focused on a saved local plan allocation at Station Road, this will deliver enhanced access to the railway station, including for public transport. The scale and location of development in Option 2 is uncertain.	Appropriate infrastructure must be provided for this level of growth to increase opportunities for healthy living, to include healthcare facilities, sport, recreation, open space and green infrastructure. Employment provision should match the skills of local people to maximise benefits from employment. Innovative sustainable transport solutions required that reduce air quality issues.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-/?	As discussed above, Option 1 supports the regeneration of the town centre, along with balanced housing and employment growth. This will help make the town more attractive to visitors and investors alike. Provision of affordable housing and job growth will also make positive contributions.	Employment provision should match the skills of local people to maximise benefits from employment. Innovative sustainable transport solutions required that reduce air quality issues and provide access to new employment areas for those without access to private transport.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-/?	Option 1 proposes that contributions from development should be focused on delivering town centre enhancement which will have a positive impact on the town overall. It is unlikely that the scale of development envisaged will deliver a significant change to community facilities. As the scale and location of growth in Option 2 is more uncertain,	None for option 1. Option 2 could be mitigated to some extent by strong policies requiring higher development contributions.

Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								impacts are unknown. However, all development will need to make some contribution to infrastructure provision overall.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	?	?	Both options would contribute to additional education provision, although if the level of growth was uncertain (Option 2) this would be more difficult to plan for. The scale of growth proposed in Option 1 is not sufficient to provide any new schools in Westbury, but would contribute to expansion of existing facilities.	Effects uncertain. Policy supporting text mentions secondary provision but not primary. Need further information on level of need and how this would be met to meet demand from 1390 new homes.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Both options	MT	R	A	L	--	--	Proposals for development in town centre can promote sustainable transport investment and give good access to railway station. Level of growth, however, will significantly exacerbate traffic and air quality issues. Proposed Hawkeridge site is well away from town centre and will generate additional road traffic. It is adjacent to an existing employment site, however, and in proximity to strategic road network. Impacts of Option 2 are uncertain, however as the scale of growth is likely to be higher, this could result in more adverse impacts.	Westbury suffers from traffic issues, including congestion from the A350 which runs through the town centre, which is also designated as an AQMA. Further detailed work is needed to identify appropriate mitigation measures to alleviate existing traffic related issues which should be undertaken in partnership with the community. Hawkeridge site – can access be provided to A350 without vehicles travelling through town centre ie new road access east to A350? Possible consideration.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	A	L	++	+	Option 1 as proposed will deliver a significant amount of new employment land in Westbury which will not only provide high quality employment land, but facilitate churn and so improvement of existing sites. The impacts of	None



Core Policy 32: Spatial Strategy: Westbury Community Area Options 1-2 (see section 5.34 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								Option 2 are more uncertain. However, the market is less likely to deliver the same level of balanced job growth. As the level of growth would be uncertain, planning for future infrastructure provision would be more difficult.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 1	MT	R	A	L	++	+	As significant employment growth will be delivered Option 1 will have a likely significant positive effect. Option 2 is less likely to deliver balanced job creation and the market is more likely to focus on housing growth where viable sites are identified.	Identifying suitable growth for both housing and employment in the Core Strategy would help alleviate the adverse impacts associated with Option 2.

### Core Policy 33: Spatial Strategy: Wilton Community Area

This policy has been subject to sustainability appraisal<sup>6</sup> as part of the development of the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). See section 5.35 main report for further details.

The South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed or downloaded from [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategy).

<sup>6</sup> South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2009)

**Core Policy 34: Additional employment land**  
**New employment land (scale)**

Core Policy 34: New employment land (scale)										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No.	MT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Development of Greenfield land likely with each option and therefore effects more likely on biodiversity. Options 2 and 3 would lead to more Greenfield land developed than Option 1.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible and avoiding sensitive locations such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Options 2 and 3 significant adverse effects.	LT	I	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Significance of effects will depend on location and amount of Greenfield land lost to development. Option 1 would require least amount of land for new development. Option 2 likely to lead to greatest loss of Greenfield land. Option 3 – no indication of how much additional would be required. Mitigation measures may be possible although not identified in policy information.	Development of brownfield sites and town centre regeneration should be the focus of policy. If Greenfield sites are required, employment opportunities should be provided in mixed-use, sustainable locations that have good access to local facilities, public transport links and existing services and facilities. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land should be minimised.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No.	?	R	C	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	No specific impacts identified at this stage. Policy concerns different scales of employment land provision. Main impacts likely to arise from waste arising from development of PDL and construction waste.	Development of any site must ensure that waste is reduced as far as possible, with on-site recycling facilities and use of recycled materials in construction. Consideration of whether waste can provide a resource for generating heat and energy.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No.	MT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Few impacts against this objective. Impacts on water resources will depend on location of specific development sites and the type of business use concerned. Further assessment required if/when sites	Policies that promote less development will have fewer impacts on water resources, especially where development on PDL. Development for employment uses should avoid areas of flood risk wherever possible.

Core Policy 34: New employment land (scale) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									identified.	Strong pollution control measures needed to protect any watercourses on or off site. Consideration of SuDS to reduce flood risk and improve water quality above and below ground.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Significance of effects dependant on location of development and employment uses. Many flood problems caused by cumulative impacts of many developments occurring over a wider area. Policies that restrict new employment development and promote development of PDL likely to have fewer impacts.	Consideration is needed of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas and appropriate adaptation measures must be employed. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. All necessary infrastructure to reduce flood risk required before any development goes ahead.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes - Option 2. Potential for mitigation measures to reduce effects.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/--	-/?	Development likely to increase existing problems relating to air quality, noise, odour and light pollution. Option 2 would lead to greatest impacts if additional identified land is developed, although mitigation measures are possible. Development of regeneration sites, many of which in town centres, could benefit from proximity to sustainable transport modes but also likely to increase town centre traffic levels.	Many effects regarding air quality, noise, light pollution and odour can be effectively reduced or mitigated through high quality design standards and sensitive location of developments that reduce impacts on people and the natural environment. Reducing amount of land developed for employment would lead to fewer impacts against this objective. Land should be identified that will form part of mixed-use developments, reducing need to travel and promotion of sustainable travel choices.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	I	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Additional employment development likely to increase emissions that could impact on climate change. Further information would be required on	Mitigation measures include incorporation of strong energy efficiency measures, use of zero/low carbon energy sources and renewable energy.

Core Policy 34: New employment land (scale) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									the location of development and the type of employment uses concerned.	Sites should be located where travel need is reduced and where there are, or could be sustainable travel choices. Climate change adaptation requires Greenfield development to be reduced wherever possible and incorporation of measures to deal with changes in weather patterns.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	These policy options relate to the identification of land for development – any development has the potential to adversely affect heritage assets. Nature of effects dependant on location and type of development proposed and proximity to sensitive locations.	Reducing amount of land developed for employment would lead to fewer impacts against this objective, as would prioritising development of PDL. Archaeological assessment should be considered prior to any development and development should minimise all impacts on any historic assets in proximity to a site.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 2.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	<b>-/--</b>	-/?	Option 2 – the significant additional amount of land being identified for development may lead to significant adverse effects, depending on the location. Mitigation measures may be possible although not identified in policy information.	Promoting development on PDL sites, many of which are located in town centre/urban locations, would reduce impacts on rural landscapes and aid regeneration, although there may be adverse effects on urban townscapes. Development should be sensitive to local character and avoid adversely affecting designated landscape areas.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No.	MT	R	C	L	+	-/+	+	Allocating land for employment should aid housing provision through providing increased job opportunities. Not considered significant as options do not expressly promote housing. Option 2 is only providing additional land in regeneration sites and mixed-use extensions – this would not benefit smaller market towns.	Policy can aid housing provision by allowing an increased amount of employment land that will increase job opportunities for local people and may help reduce levels of out-commuting.

Core Policy 34: New employment land (scale) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	Some benefits could be expected through increased job opportunities and effects on health and wellbeing. Research has shown that health inequalities can be increased by unemployment and lack of work opportunities.	Increasing available employment land, allowing local businesses to expand and attracting inward investment can play a positive role in reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing among Wiltshire's residents. All employment sites should be easily accessible by walking and cycling and contribute to a Wiltshire-wide GI network that can have significant health and recreation benefits.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/- ?	+	Benefits from increased job opportunities. Not considered significant as it will not significantly improve current situation. Option 2 – benefits for larger market towns but not smaller market towns.	Increasing available employment land, allowing local businesses to expand and attracting inward investment can play a positive role in reducing poverty and deprivation. Policy should not be restricted to 'regeneration areas and mixed-use urban extensions' but should benefit all communities across Wiltshire.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	+	+/- ?	+	Benefits from all options. Employment opportunities will increase the viability of existing community (and other) services and facilities and may help others to establish. Option 2 would not benefit smaller market towns.	Policy should benefit key services and facilities across all of Wiltshire's communities. Option 2 will not do this. Option 3 does not promote inward investment, only 'relocation from inappropriate premises' – attracting new businesses would further increase viability of key community services.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	+/?	+/- ?	+/?	All options will help retain skills in the area. However, there are concerns with options in terms of ability to attract inward investment, provide for additional demand and/or provide opportunities in the smaller market towns.	In order to retain existing skills and attract new skilled workers, this policy should allow for additional growth in all Wiltshire communities, not be restricted to regeneration or mixed-use extensions or just provide for relocation from inappropriate premises. Amendments are needed to all policy options to allow all

Core Policy 34: New employment land (scale) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										communities to retain and attract new skills.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No.	MT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	All options likely to increase need to travel and increase private car journeys. Mitigation measures possible.	Reducing amount of land developed for employment would lead to fewer impacts against this objective. Land should be identified that will form part of mixed-use developments, reducing need to travel and promotion of sustainable travel choices.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	All options likely to benefit local economy but concerns/restrictions with each.	Policy should allow for additional growth in all Wiltshire communities, not be restricted to regeneration or mixed-use extensions or just provide for relocation from inappropriate premises. Amendments are needed to all policy options to remove various restrictions and allow greater economic benefits.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Options 2 and 3.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	++/-	++/-	Options 2 and 3 should provide significant additional amounts of employment land compared to Option 1. However, both options will also restrict growth in some areas.	As 16 above.

**Core Policy 34: Additional employment land**  
**New employment land (location)**

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Development of Greenfield land likely with each option and therefore effects more likely on biodiversity. Potential for mitigation with all options. Significance of effects will depend on location of new development within each area and effectiveness of mitigation measures incorporated. Option 1 most favourable as would focus on several larger sites that could provide biodiversity benefits and enhancement.	Policy should seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity by developing brownfield sites wherever possible and avoiding sensitive locations such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and loss/damage to ancient woodland. Where development would be near to designated sites, consideration should be given to protecting and enhancing those sites, use of large buffer zones and reducing all types of disturbance including recreational.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes - Option 1 most likely.	LT	I	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Option 1 would need to meet all of Wiltshire's demand in 3 settlements. This would require large sites with the assumption most development on Greenfield land in edge of town locations. Options 2/3 would be spread across more towns with opportunities for PDL use and remediation. Significance of effects will depend on location and amount of Greenfield land lost to development.	Development of brownfield sites and town centre regeneration should be the focus of policy. If Greenfield sites are required, employment opportunities should be provided in mixed-use, sustainable locations that have good access to local facilities, public transport links and existing services and facilities. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land should be minimised.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	Main impacts likely to arise from waste arising from development of PDL and construction waste. No specific	Development of any site must ensure that waste is reduced as far as possible, with on-site recycling facilities and use of recycled

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
									impacts from policy options at this stage. Specific effects can only be determined when development locations and/or types are known.	materials in construction. Consideration of whether waste can provide a resource for generating heat and energy.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No but depends on location and employment uses.	MT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Impacts on water resources will depend on location of specific development sites and the type of business use concerned. Further assessment required if/when sites identified. Option 1 is more likely to require development of Greenfield land and therefore greater potential for adverse impacts on watercourses such as rivers Avon and Biss and loss of permeable surfaces which can increase flood risk.	Policies that are more likely to result in development of PDL will have fewer impacts on water resources and watercourses. However, if just a few large sites are being considered, this may provide opportunities for greater protection of watercourses and surface water attenuation that can reduce flood risk. Development for employment uses should avoid areas of flood risk wherever possible. Strong pollution control measures needed to protect any watercourses on or off site. Consideration of SuDS to reduce flood risk and improve water quality above and below ground.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No but depends on location.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	All options have the potential to increase flood risk. Significance of effects dependant on location of development and employment uses. Many flood problems caused by cumulative impacts of many developments occurring over a wider area. Option 1 likely to be several large sites with potential for reducing flood risk but also likely these will be Greenfield sites.	Consideration is needed of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas and appropriate adaptation measures must be employed. Sequential approach/test required – development should be in FZ1 first. All necessary infrastructure to reduce flood risk required before any development goes ahead.



Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
									Policies that are more likely to result in development of PDL will have fewer impacts.	
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes – Option 1.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	All options likely to lead to adverse effects against this objective. Option 1 would require large employment sites to meet all of Wiltshire's need and this would significantly exacerbate traffic related problems and impact on air quality in those 3 places.	Many effects can be effectively reduced or mitigated through high quality design standards and sensitive location of developments that reduce impacts on people and the natural environment. Land should be identified in all communities across Wiltshire and larger employment areas should form part of mixed-use developments, reducing need to travel and promotion of sustainable travel choices.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	I	B	L	-/+ ?	-/?	-/?	All options likely to lead to adverse effects against this objective. Additional employment development likely to increase emissions that could impact on climate change in the long term through direct and indirect sources. Further information would be required on the location of development and the type of employment uses concerned. Option 1, where employment may be located on a few strategic sites, may offer greatest opportunities for reducing impacts through mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures include incorporation of effective energy efficiency measures, use of zero/low carbon energy sources and renewable energy. Sites should be located where travel need is reduced and where there are, or could be sustainable travel choices. Climate change adaptation requires Greenfield development to be reduced wherever possible and incorporation of measures to deal with changes in weather patterns. Option 1, if there are a small number of large strategic sites, could reduce impacts by considering measures such as CHP, on-site renewable energy and district heating schemes.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Whether development is located in just a few towns or all, there is the potential to adversely affect heritage assets.	Archaeological assessment should be considered prior to any development and development should minimise all impacts on

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
									Nature of effects dependant on location and type of development proposed and proximity to sensitive locations. Further assessment required of sites when information available.	historic assets in proximity to a site.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 1.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	All options may adversely affect this objective. Significance will depend on location, types of use and design standards. Option 1 may significantly affect Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury but would not affect any other towns. Options 2 and 3 would have some impacts across a larger area but may not be as significant.	All employment land should not be provided in just 3 settlements. This would have significant impacts on landscapes within and around these places. Significant development should be avoided in AONB and other locally important landscape areas. Promoting development on PDL sites, many of which are located in town centre/urban locations, would reduce impacts on rural landscapes and aid regeneration, although there may be adverse effects on urban townscapes. Development should be sensitive to local character through appropriate design standards.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-/?	+/?	+/?	Options 2 and 3 will provide for employment opportunities in many more settlements which will indirectly support housing growth. Option 1 will adversely affect housing provision in all other towns except those 3 settlements because employment opportunities will be severely restricted.	Employment opportunities can aid housing growth which in turn can provide contributions towards a range of social infrastructure and boost vitality of a community. Policy should promote employment provision in all communities to benefit housing and economic growth.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	+	Levels of health and wellbeing are often related to availability of work and	Increasing employment opportunities in all communities and attracting inward

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
									economic opportunities. Option 1 will reduce opportunities in all but the 3 settlements. Option 3 will benefit all communities. Addressing employment provision in rural areas is required.	investment can play a positive role in reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing among Wiltshire's residents. All employment sites should be easily accessible by walking and cycling and contribute to a Wiltshire-wide GI network that can have significant health and recreation benefits.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	+	Option 1 will reduce employment opportunities throughout much of Wiltshire which will affect the causes of poverty and deprivation. Option 2 will benefit many communities but not all.	Increasing employment land provision in all communities, including rural, allowing local businesses to expand and attracting inward investment can play a positive role in reducing poverty and deprivation, and enhancing quality of life. Provision should not be restricted to just a handful of larger towns but should benefit all communities across Wiltshire.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	+/?	Effects not considered significant but Option 1 will adversely affect community and other social infrastructure in all communities except the 3 named.	Policy should benefit key services and facilities across all of Wiltshire's communities by allowing some opportunities for employment growth. Jobs will provide benefits for the local economy, health and wellbeing and social inclusion which in turn will increase viability of a range of services and facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	Yes Options 1 and 3	MT	R	C	L	--	+/?	++/?	Option 1 will allow skills retention in the 3 named settlements but will have a detrimental effect elsewhere. Option 2 will allow skills retention in some areas but not others while Option 3 will have significant benefits	In order to retain existing skills and attract new skilled workers, policy should allow for additional growth in all Wiltshire communities, not be restricted to some market towns. Rural areas also need some employment opportunities.

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op3		
									for skills retention, training, apprenticeships etc to provide for local businesses.	Amendments are needed to all policy options to allow all communities to retain and attract new skills.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Option1	MT	R	B	L	--/+	-	-	Options 2 and 3 will increase self-containment of many settlements but will still lead to an increase in traffic overall. Option 1 will lead to significantly increased travel from across Wiltshire because employment opportunities will not be available in other areas. No options provide for need in rural areas and this will increase travel need.	Option 1 which it is assumed will provide for employment on large strategic sites out-of-town, will offer some opportunities to significantly improve sustainable transport choice. However, these areas will likely not be in proximity to train stations and an increase in car and lorry journeys is expected. Locating employment close to town centres is the most sustainable way of increasing choice.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes all options	LT	R	B	L	++ --	++/ -	++/?	All options will have significant benefits for employment and the local economy. Option 1 will benefit Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury mostly but provide few opportunities for other towns. Option 3 – need more information on what ‘list of criteria’ is as this will also influence significance of effects. Addressing employment provision in rural areas is required.	Policy must provide employment and economic opportunities in all Wiltshire settlements, including villages and rural areas. Amendments are needed to all policy options to remove various restrictions and allow greater economic benefits.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes all options	LT	R	B	L	++ --	++/ -	++/?	All options will have significant benefits for employment and the local economy. Option 1 will benefit Trowbridge, Chippenham and Salisbury mostly but provide few opportunities for other towns. Option 3 – need more information on what ‘list	Policy must provide employment and economic opportunities in all Wiltshire settlements, including villages and rural areas. Amendments are needed to all policy options to remove various restrictions and allow greater economic benefits.

Core Policy 34: New employment land (location) Options 1-3 (see section 5.36 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									of criteria' is as this will also influence significance of effects. Addressing employment provision in rural areas is required.	

### Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites

Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.37 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	0	Options 1 and 2 would not protect all sites. This may lead to changes of use which could adversely affect biodiversity on site or in vicinity.	Biodiversity should be protected and enhanced on all employment sites, including if change of use occurs.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	Policy relates to existing employment sites which are already developed. Issues may arise if change of use occurs and remediation of land required.	If change of use occurs, particular attention should be given to remediation of contaminated land
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	0	0	No specific concerns. Existing employment sites. Issues may arise if change of use occurs – this more likely with Option 1.	If change of use occurs, particular attention should be given to the appropriate disposal of waste, a proportion of which may be toxic or contaminated.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	B	L	-/?	0	0	No specific concerns. Existing employment sites. Issues may arise if change of use occurs and remediation is required –	If change of use occurs, particular attention should be given to the remediation of contaminated land and protection of watercourses in vicinity and groundwater.

Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.37 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									this more likely with Option 1. Potential for contamination of watercourses and groundwater.	Also, consideration of climate change adaptation in terms of water efficiency in existing and new development.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	B	L	+/?	0	0	Potential for further measures to be incorporated to reduce flood risk and climate change adaptation if Option 1 leads to change of use. Change of use and location dependant.	Particular attention should be given to reducing any potential flood risk, incorporation of measures such as SuDS and possibilities of reducing flood risk in other areas.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/-?	0	0	Option 1 more likely to lead to change of use of some sites. Potential to improve on current situation, depending on location and new use(s). However, this option may also increase need to travel for work across Wiltshire.	Consideration should be given to promoting sustainable transport solutions and enhancing viability of employment areas that are in or close to town centres. Also, reducing impacts of noise, light and odour on residential areas.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	I	B	L	+/?	0	0	Option 1 more likely to lead to change of use of some sites. Potential to improve on current situation, depending on location and new use(s).	Consideration should be given to promoting sustainable transport solutions and enhancing viability of employment areas that are in or close to town centres. The possibilities for improving energy efficiency, provision and use of renewable energy and CHP should be investigated.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	0	0	Any impacts will depend on site location. Option 1 more likely to lead to change of use of some sites and this may provide opportunities to improve enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.	Archaeological assessment should be considered prior to any change of use and development should minimise all impacts on historic assets in proximity to a site.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	0	0	Any impacts will depend on site location. Option 1 more likely to lead to change of use of some sites and this may provide opportunities to	Any new development or change of use should take the opportunity to enhance local landscape character through high quality design that reflects local character, protecting

Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.37 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									enhance local landscape character through high quality design, landscaping and provision of GI.	rights of way and community open space.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	0	-/?	Option 1 would allow some sites to be made available for housing. Option 3 would give more protection to all sites, therefore reducing possibility of change of use for housing. This would prevent provision of much needed housing in some communities.	Policy should allow the change of use of some smaller employment sites where the value for housing provision in that area would be greater eg if affordable housing is needed.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/+ ?	+/?	+/?	Overall, Option 1 could adversely affect health and wellbeing if it reduces employment opportunities but could also benefit if change of use to housing results. Options 2/3 would protect employment sites with consequent health benefits through job creation.	Increasing employment opportunities through protection of employment sites can play a positive role in reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing among Wiltshire's residents. Any change of use should increase opportunities for healthy recreation, incorporate open space and contribute to appropriate health services and infrastructure.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No.	MT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	+/?	Option 1 will reduce employment opportunities in some areas which will affect the causes of poverty and deprivation. Options 2 and 3 will provide much greater protection of employment sites across Wiltshire.	Protecting employment sites in all communities, including rural locations, allowing local businesses to expand and attracting inward investment can play a positive role in reducing poverty and deprivation, reducing social exclusion and enhancing quality of life. Protection should not be restricted to just 'strategic' sites in certain towns.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	0/?	0	Loss of employment sites, most likely through Option 1, could affect the	Protection of all employment sites likely to maintain viability of key community

Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.37 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									viability of key local community services/facilities. Options 2 may have some impact	services/facilities. Jobs will provide benefits for the local economy, health and wellbeing and social inclusion which in turn will increase viability of a range of services and facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	Yes Options 1 and 3	MT	R	C	L	--	+/?	++/?	Option 1 will allow skills retention only where there are 'strategic' sites and this will have a detrimental effect elsewhere where significant numbers of sites could be lost to other uses. Option 2 will allow skills retention in some areas but not others while Option 3 will have significant benefits for skills retention, training, apprenticeships etc through protection of all employment sites.	In order to retain existing skills and attract new skilled workers, policy should allow for protection of sites in all communities, not protect strategic sites only. Rural areas also need employment opportunities and protection of rural sites should be strongly considered in policy.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes Option 1	LT	R	B	L	--	-/?	0	Option 1 could lead to loss of many smaller employment sites, significantly increasing need to travel for jobs elsewhere in the county or further afield.	Employment sites should be protected locally so that travel need is reduced. All employment sites should consider ways of giving a wider choice of sustainable transport means.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes all options	LT	R	B	L	++/? --/?	++/?	++	All options are likely to lead to significant economic benefits. Option 1 however will mainly benefit those settlements with 'strategic' sites and other communities may lose sites which play a very important role in the local community. Concerns that Option 2 would not protect rural employment sites.	Policy must provide for protection of all employment sites that are of value and play an important economic and social role in a community. Losing sites to other uses will lead to loss of jobs, skills and subsequent social impacts on the fabric of communities.



Core Policy 35: Existing employment sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.37 for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
17. Employment	Yes all options	LT	R	B	L	--/?	++/?	++	Option 1 will lead to the loss of many smaller sites which play a very important role in the local community. Concerns that Option 2 would not protect rural employment sites.	Policy must provide for protection of all employment sites that are of value and play an important economic and social role in a community. Losing sites to other uses will lead to loss of jobs, skills and subsequent social impacts on the fabric of communities.

### Core Policy 36: Economic regeneration

Core Policy 36: Economic Regeneration Options 1-3 (see section 5.38 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
1. Biodiversity	No – few impacts envisaged.	MT	R	A	L	?	?	?	Effects on biodiversity will depend on location of any development and proposed uses.	Development on brownfield sites likely to result in fewer adverse impacts. Biodiversity should be protected and enhanced on all sites with appropriate ecological assessment and mitigation measures agreed prior to development.
2. Land and soil	Option 2 significant benefits.	LT	I	C	L	+	++	+	All policies will lead to positive effects against this objective but option 2 likely to lead to regeneration of more brownfield sites in a greater number of locations. Option 2 will support vision and community led approach.	A policy that promotes development of brownfield land in or in close proximity to town centres should be pursued.
3. Waste management	No – few impacts envisaged.	MT	R	A	L	0/?	0/?	0/?	Main impacts likely to arise from waste arising from development of PDL and construction waste. No specific impacts from policy options at this	Development of any site must ensure that waste is reduced as far as possible, with on-site recycling facilities and use of recycled materials in construction.

Core Policy 36: Economic Regeneration Options 1-3 (see section 5.38 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									stage. Specific effects can only be determined when development locations and/or types are known.	Consideration of whether waste can provide a resource for generating heat and energy.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No – few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	0	0	-	Option 3 focuses more on Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge and may adversely affect watercourses in other areas due to Greenfield development.	A policy that promotes development of brownfield land, reducing loss of Greenfield land should be pursued.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No – few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	0	0	-	Option 3 focuses more on Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge and may lead to additional Greenfield development that will increase flood risk.	A policy that promotes development of brownfield land, reducing loss of Greenfield land should be pursued in order to reduce risk of flooding. Incorporation of measures such as SuDS and possibilities of reducing flood risk in other areas should be considered.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No but adverse effects overall.	MT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Policies promote development of land. Likely to increase adverse effects against this objective directly and indirectly through increased travel need.	Extent of effects dependent on use and location. Town centre regeneration could increase sustainable transport choice and availability but could also lead to increased congestion and adverse impacts on air quality.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No but adverse effects overall.	LT	I	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Policies promote development of land. Likely to increase adverse effects against this objective directly and indirectly through increased travel need.	Extent of effects dependent on use and location. Town centre regeneration could increase sustainable transport choice and availability but could also lead to increased congestion and adverse impacts on air quality.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No but adverse effects overall.	LT	R	A	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Potential for adverse impacts, dependent on use, design and location. Mitigation possible. Many town centre	Policy should promote development in locations that avoid adversely impacting important heritage assets.

<b>Core Policy 36: Economic Regeneration</b>										
<b>Options 1-3 (see section 5.38 of main report for details of options)</b>										
<b>Sustainability appraisal objective</b>	<b>Are significant effects likely?</b>	<b>Assessment of effects</b>				<b>Significance</b>			<b>Justification and evidence</b>	<b>Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>Op 1</b>	<b>Op 2</b>	<b>Op 3</b>		
									locations are near to conservation areas and other important historic features.	
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No but adverse effects overall.	LT	I/R	A	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Effects dependent on location of development, use and design. All options likely to have some adverse effects on urban or rural landscapes/townscapes.	Significant development should be avoided where it would impact on a national or local landscape designation. All development should be located and designed to respect and be sensitive to local landscape characteristics.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Policy is promoting regeneration of employment sites.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No but positive effects from all options.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	Regeneration of employment sites will provide jobs locally and help improve vitality and viability of other businesses. This can have positive effects on health and wellbeing.	Extent of effects dependent on location of development and type of jobs created.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No but positive effects from all options.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	Regeneration of employment sites will provide jobs locally and help improve vitality and viability of other businesses. This can have positive effects for quality of life and reducing social exclusion through employment provision.	Extent of effects dependent on location of development and type of jobs created.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No but positive effects from all options.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	Regenerating sites for employment can allow greater viability of local community facilities and provide funding for new facilities.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No but positive effects from all options.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	+/?	Regenerating sites for employment can allow skills retention, attract skilled workers to Wiltshire and result in new training and apprenticeship opportunities.	None.

Core Policy 36: Economic Regeneration										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.38 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
15. Transport	No but adverse effects overall.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	Regeneration of sites will increase need to travel. All options. Effects dependent on location and employment uses.	Promotion of town centre sites could reduce travel and these sites should be the focus of policy.
16. Economy	Option 2 significant positive.	LT	R	B	L	+	++	+	All options will benefit local economy and increase employment opportunities. Option 2 likely to have significant benefits as less restrictive policy benefitting all communities across Wiltshire.	Focus of policy should be on town centre regeneration but out-of-town sites will also benefit economy and job provision. Consideration of improving economic and employment opportunities in rural communities is needed.
17. Employment	Option 2 significant positive.	LT	R	B	L	+	++	+	All options will benefit local economy and increase employment opportunities. Option 2 likely to have significant benefits as less restrictive policy benefitting all communities across Wiltshire.	Focus of policy should be on town centre regeneration but out-of-town sites will also benefit economy and job provision. Consideration of improving economic and employment opportunities in rural communities is needed.

### Core Policy 37: Military establishments

Core Policy 37: Military establishments										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.39 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
1. Biodiversity	Yes Option 2	MT	R	A	L	-/?	--	+	Option 1 may still adversely affect biodiversity through development. Option 2 may result in development that is not in keeping with scale, character and location and could lead to inappropriate development at	All development should protect and enhance existing biodiversity. Appropriate ecological assessment would be required. Sensitive locations such as designated wildlife sites, areas where protected or notable species are present and ancient woodland

Core Policy 37: Military establishments Options 1-3 (see section 5.39 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									remote rural locations.	requires specific protection and mitigation.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	C	L	++	+	-	Option 1 encourages the re-use and redevelopment of existing facilities in sustainable locations. Options 2 and 3 are either too restrictive or will allow all development, even in inappropriate locations.	Policy should focus on developing brownfield sites and redundant buildings that are well located to their settlement and in sustainable locations that are near to town centres and public transport connectivity. Appropriate remediation of contaminated sites required.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No few impacts.	MT	R	C	L	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	-	Options 1 and 2 will allow remediation of contaminated land that could allow improvement of local watercourses and water bodies in the medium to long term.	Care should be taken not to pollute nearby watercourses during land remediation.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	?	+	Some benefits could be achieved through incorporating flood prevention measures such as SuDS and by increasing flood storage capacity.	Consideration is needed of on-site measures such as SuDS but also larger schemes such as surface water attenuation and flood storage schemes. Future impacts of climate change could lead to increased risk of flooding in all areas and appropriate adaptation measures must be employed. Sequential approach/test may be required – development should be in FZ1 first. All necessary infrastructure to reduce flood risk required before any development goes ahead.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	+	No significant effects likely. Options 1 and 3 will ensure appropriate development in more sustainable locations where public transport connectivity may be better. Would also reduce noise, light, odour issues in more remote rural locations.	To reduce impacts of environmental pollution, policy should encourage development in sustainable locations and ensure new uses are appropriate to their location. Uses that emit noise, odour etc would be inappropriate on some sites.

Core Policy 37: Military establishments Options 1-3 (see section 5.39 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	-	-	Any development, in any location, is likely to adversely affect this objective. Mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts.	Extent of effects dependent on new use, location and measures employed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Town centre regeneration could increase sustainable transport choice and availability but could also lead to increased congestion and adverse impacts on air quality.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	+	Option 2 will lead to development in inappropriate locations that could harm heritage assets. Options 1 and 3 provide opportunities to enhance assets and their setting.	Policy should promote development in locations that avoid adversely impacting important heritage assets. It is also important that the policy allows the cultural and historic significance of Wiltshire's military establishments to be understood to inform the scope and form of any future use.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Options 1 and 2	LT	R	A	L	++	--	+	Developing redundant MOD sites and buildings allows significant opportunities to enhance rural and urban landscapes. Option 2 could significantly harm landscapes through inappropriate development.	Significant development should be avoided where it would impact on a national or local landscape designation. All development should be located and designed to respect and be sensitive to local landscape characteristics.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	C	L	+	++	+	Housing provision possible on all sites. Option 2 provides more opportunities.	Consideration should be given to providing for more houses instead of focusing on uses B1, B2, B8, C1, D1 and D2.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+	+	All options allow opportunities to enhance health and wellbeing through greater employment opportunities, provision of other services and facilities and green infrastructure.	Consideration of high quality design can improve the feel of a place for residents/employees/visitors and also help reduce crime and the fear of crime.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	+	All options allow opportunities for increased employment and corresponding increases in social	None.

Core Policy 37: Military establishments										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.39 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									inclusion.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	+	All options allow opportunities for increased provision of community services and facilities.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	+	All options allow opportunities for increased employment and corresponding skills retention and attraction.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	-	All options encourage development which will increase need to travel. Option 2 would allow inappropriate development in remote rural locations – this may encourage more travel by private car compared with other two options.	Priority should be for redevelopment of sites in sustainable locations, well located to existing settlements and public transport services. If development takes place in more remote locations, significant infrastructure in sustainable transport modes should be put in place.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	B	L	+	++	+	All options likely to benefit local economy and provide substantial number of jobs. Option 2 significant as it would allow all proposals for redevelopment.	None.
<b>17. Employment</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	B	L	+	++	+	All options likely to benefit local economy and provide substantial number of jobs. Option 2 significant as it would allow all proposals for redevelopment.	None.

## Core Policy 38: Retail and leisure

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 1-2 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres, which in itself could be more beneficial towards biodiversity.	None
2. Land and soil	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres thus ensuring the efficient use of land.	None
3. Waste management	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
5. Flood risk	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres and could reduce trips by car and reducing environmental pollution.	None
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres and could reduce trips by car and reducing environmental pollution.	None
8. Historic environment	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres and could help protect landscapes on the edge of towns.	None
10. Housing	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
11. Healthy communities	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
12. Poverty and	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land,	None



Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 1-2 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
deprivation								although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres which should be more inclusive than option 2.	
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
15. Transport	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 1 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres and could reduce trips by car and reducing environmental pollution.	None
16. Economy	Yes	LT	R	A	U	++	--	Positive significant effect from option 1 and possible major adverse effect from option 2 if no protection is provided to our town centres.	None
17. Employment	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Protecting vitality and viability of town centre retail and leisure facilities will maintain and enhance employment opportunities.	None

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 3-6 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 3	Op 4	Op 5	Op 6		
1. Biodiversity	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
3. Waste management	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
5. Flood risk	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 3-6 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 3	Op 4	Op 5	Op 6		
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
8. Historic environment	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
11. Healthy communities	No	LT	R	A	U	+	+	0	+	Option 3, 4 and 6 may have a positive impact on protecting rural communities and their way of life by attempting to protect village and town centres.	None.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	LT	R	A	U	+	+	0	+	Option 3, 4 and 6 may have a positive impact on protecting rural communities and their way of life by attempting to protect village and town centres.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	A	U	+	+	0	+	Option 3, 4 and 6 may have a positive impact on protecting rural communities and their way of life by attempting to protect village and town centres and ensuring facilities are in the centre thus improving access.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	A	U	+	+	0	+	Few if any impacts envisaged as policy does not allocate land, although option 3, 4 and 5 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres and could reduce trips by car and reducing environmental pollution.	None
16. Economy	Yes	LT	R	A	U	++	++	--	++	Positive significant effect from option 3, 4 and 6 as frontages attempt to protect town centres. Smaller centres should have the opportunity to also introduce their own frontage policies. Possible major adverse effect from	None

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 3-6 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 3	Op 4	Op 5	Op 6		
										option 5 if no protection is provided to our town centres.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+	-	+	Protecting vitality and viability of town centre retail and leisure facilities will maintain and enhance employment opportunities. Option 5 would reduce employment opportunities by deleting frontages.	None

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 7-8 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures	
		T	R	S	L	Op 7	Op 8			
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	?	-	Few if any impacts envisaged, although, option 7 aims to try and direct retail development towards town centres, which in itself could be more beneficial towards biodiversity compared to option 8.	Policies when drafted in full should take account and try and protect biodiversity.	
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes	LT	I	C	L	++	--	Option 7 directs any retail allocations to town centre possibly brownfield sites whereas option implies possible out of town Greenfield locations.	Policies needs to ensure that town centre sites come forward first in line with option 7 rather than 8.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	Few impacts are envisaged, however when allocating retail sites any policy needs to ensure that waste is minimised.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	?	?	Few if any impacts envisaged.	Few impacts are envisaged, however when allocating retail sites any policy needs to ensure that water resources are protected.	
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	?	?	Few if any impacts envisaged.	Few impacts are envisaged, however when allocating retail sites any policy needs to ensure that the sequential test in PPS25 is	

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 7-8 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 7	Op 8		
									followed.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Option 7 aims to direct retail development towards town centres which should minimise trip generation. Option 8 directs development out of town which could possibly create negative effects.	Few impacts envisaged, however when allocating retail sites, environmental pollution needs to be considered.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Option 7 aims to direct retail development towards town centres which should minimise trip generation. Option 8 directs development out of town which could possibly create negative effects.	Few impacts envisaged, however when allocating retail sites, environmental pollution needs to be considered.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	However any retail site allocation needs to ensure that it protects, maintains and enhances Wiltshire's historic environment.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes	LT	R	A	U	0	--	Option 7 directing retail development to the town centres should have a neutral effect on landscapes, however, option 8 could have a significantly adverse effect on landscapes as this could direct development to Greenfield sites to the edge of centres.	Direct retail development towards town centres.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	However, more detailed allocation policy needs to ensure good design including greenspace.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Option 7 directs development towards the town centres, which should aid inclusion, especially those that do not have access to a car. Option 8, promoting retail development to out of town could increase exclusion.	None
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Option 7 directs development towards the town centres, which should aid access, especially those that do not have access to a car. Option 8, promoting retail development to out of town could increase exclusion.	None
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None

Core Policy 38: Retail and Leisure Options 7-8 (see section 5.40 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 7	Op 8		
15. Transport	No	LT	R	A	U	+	?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Option 7 aims to direct retail development towards town centres which should minimise trip generation. Option 8 directs development out of town which could possibly create negative effects.	Few impacts envisaged, however when allocating retail sites, pollution from transport and trips generated needs to be considered.
16. Economy	Yes	LT	I	A	L	++	--	Positive significant effect from option 7 and possible major adverse effect from option 8 if no protection is provided to our town centres.	None
17. Employment	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None

### Core policy 39 - Tourist development

Core Policy 39: Tourism development Options 1-2 (see section 5.41 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Specific policy relating to tourist development that recognises potential for environmental impacts.	Need clear links between this policy and policies relating to biodiversity/landscape protection. This policy could make it clear that new development should also enhance biodiversity, in line with other policies, not just protect.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	I	C	L	+	0	Policy promotes new tourist development in or close to existing settlements and in existing or replacement buildings. This will prevent loss of Greenfield land and lead to development in more sustainable locations.	Policy needs to address new facilities in the countryside that are <b>not</b> in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction. This is not particularly clear. New development in the countryside will need to mitigate transport impacts and incorporate sustainable transport links.
3. Waste	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged.	None.

Core Policy 39: Tourism development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.41 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
management									
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Some benefits from a policy that promotes development in more sustainable locations and use of existing buildings.	None.
5. Flood risk	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Some benefits from a policy that promotes development in more sustainable locations and use of existing buildings. This will reduce Greenfield land loss.	None.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Some benefits from a policy that promotes development in existing settlements – this can reduce transport impacts giving more opportunities for public transport use.	None. Links with air quality policy requiring new development to mitigate additional emission levels.
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	R	B	L	+	0	Some benefits from a policy that promotes development in existing settlements and use of existing buildings – this can reduce need to travel and emissions related to constructing new buildings.	None. Links with sustainable construction and low-carbon energy policy requiring new development to mitigate additional emission levels.
8. Historic environment	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Benefits from directing development to existing settlements.	Policy could make specific reference to protecting or enhancing heritage assets instead of 'environmentally sensitive sites'. Some proposals may wish to locate in or in proximity to heritage assets and this needs addressing in the policy.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Benefits from directing development to existing settlements. Policy recognises Wiltshire's high quality landscapes and that this is a major element in attracting visitors. Sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments need to respect the character of the countryside as well as protecting landscapes.	Policy needs to address new facilities in the countryside that are <b>not</b> in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction. This is not particularly clear. New development in the countryside that is not connected to a particular attraction will need to consider landscape impacts, particularly in AONBs.
10. Housing	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged.	None.

Core Policy 39: Tourism development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.41 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
11. Healthy communities	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-	Benefits with regard tourism related employment and protection of landscapes which will have long-term benefits for quality of life in Wiltshire.	None.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	Benefits with regard tourism related employment and protection of landscapes which will have long-term benefits for quality of life in Wiltshire.	None.
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	Policy provides a positive steer towards tourism development in sustainable locations. This will increase viability of existing services/facilities and allow new tourism related facilities.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Policy will provide tourism related employment opportunities, helping to retain skills and attract inward investment.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	Benefits from directing development to existing settlements. Policy specifically requires proposals to consider the transport implications of new development.	None.
16. Economy	No	LT	R	B	L	+/?	+	Policy is mainly related to the location of tourism development and as such will not have significant benefits in itself. It will increase vitality and viability of existing centres and services/facilities and help protect Wiltshire's landscapes which will have long-term economic benefits.	Policy needs to support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural businesses. This should include supporting facilities where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres. Policy possibly slightly restrictive and may limit some new tourism development in rural areas. New development that significantly boosts jobs and local economy should be looked on favourably.
17. Employment	No	LT	R	B	L	+/?	+	Policy is mainly related to the location of tourism development and as such will not have significant benefits in itself for jobs.	Policy possibly slightly restrictive and may limit some new tourism development in rural areas. New development that significantly boosts jobs

Core Policy 39: Tourism development Options 1-2 (see section 5.41 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								Tourism industry is significant employer in Wiltshire. This positive policy will benefit employment directly and other businesses indirectly eg pubs and village stores.	and local economy should be looked on favourably.

### Core Policy 40 – Hotels, Bed and Breakfasts, guest houses and conference facilities

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This is the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.42 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
1. Social inclusion for all	0	Neutral effect
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	0	Neutral effect
3. Improve health and well being of population	+	Provision of employment, which is protected by this policy, is beneficial for health and well being.
4. Improve safety and reduce crime	0	Neutral effect
5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities	0	Neutral effect
6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace	0	Neutral effect
7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources	0	Neutral effect
8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling	0	Neutral effect
9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	-	The scale of new businesses allowed in areas with poor public transport connections should be controlled. This applies particularly to the smaller settlements and the open countryside. Potential for adverse effect.



<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	-	Allowing development adjacent to settlements will involve the use of greenfield sites which could have adverse and irreversible implications for biodiversity. Potential for adverse effect which will be site specific.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	-	Allowing development adjacent to settlements will involve the use of greenfield sites which could have adverse and irreversible implications for landscape quality. Potential for adverse effect which will be site specific.
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	+	The policy directly addresses this objective.
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	+	The policy directly addresses this objective.
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	+	As some of these facilities will be in town centres the policy supports the objective of maintaining and enhancing the viability of town centres, the policy also specifies that there should be no adverse effect on primary shopping frontages.
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	+	The policy supports the reuse of buildings of historic interest.

## Core Policy 41: Sustainable construction and low-carbon energy

Core Policy 41: Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Options 1-3 (see section 5.43 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	C	L	+	0	--/?	Failure to address climate change will significantly affect biodiversity. Native habitats and species will be adversely affected, but other species and habitats may benefit.	Strongest mitigation measures required to reduce impacts on climate change through reducing emissions. Adaptation measures required to enlarge protected wildlife areas and develop wildlife corridors to help species migrate.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	0	0	Neutral impacts.	None.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	?	0	Option 1 – stronger sustainable construction requirements. May reduce waste.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+/?	-	Options 1 and 2 contain measures to mitigate and adapt to future impacts of climate change. This may reduce impacts of water availability and pollution to watercourses.	Adaptation must incorporate measures to ensure sufficient availability of potable water and to cope with future changes in rainfall patterns.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	C	L	+	+/?	--	Options 1 and 2 more likely to mitigate impacts, thus reducing higher intensity rainfall events, and to adapt to such events if/when they occur. Option 3 will lead to significant deterioration, particularly in our ability to adapt to future climate change.	None.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	-	Option 1 more likely to improve air quality through emissions reductions. Options 2 and 3 no benefits likely and reduced air quality considering amount of housing/employment proposed.	Need to ensure reduction in all polluting emissions not just those relating to climate change.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes Options 1 and	LT	R	B	L	++	+	-	Option 1 will significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions through	None.

Core Policy 41: Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Options 1-3 (see section 5.43 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
	3								sustainable construction requirements and maximising opportunities for delivering decentralised, low-carbon and renewable energy in new developments.	
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	0	-	Climate change can impact adversely on heritage assets and Wiltshire is blessed with many. Option 1 – benefits likely through mitigation and adaptation measures.	Adaptation should include developing action plan for dealing with any adverse impacts on Wiltshire's heritage.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	0	-	Wiltshire's traditional landscapes could be significantly altered through climate change. Option 1 most likely to benefit, although global issues likely to be more significant.	None.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	No effects envisaged on this objective.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	-	Option 1 most likely to benefit health and wellbeing through mitigation and adaptation requirements, including good design and sustainable construction.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	No effects envisaged on this objective.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	No effects envisaged on this objective.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	No effects envisaged on this objective.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	No effects envisaged on this objective.	None.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	-	Option 1 and 2 both likely to benefit local economy and employment by incorporating adaptation measures that will reduce damage to infrastructure and associated costs in the future.	Some uncertainty over any costs to developers and local economy from introducing these measures. Further research may be required to assess impacts.
<b>17.</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	-	Option 1 and 2 both likely to benefit local	Some uncertainty over any costs to developers

Core Policy 41: Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Options 1-3 (see section 5.43 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
Employment									economy and employment by incorporating adaptation measures that will reduce damage to infrastructure and associated costs in the future.	and local economy from introducing these measures. Further research may be required to assess impacts.

### Core Policy 42: Standalone renewable energy installations

Core Policy 42: Standalone renewable energy installations Options 1-2 (see section 5.44 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	Not known at this stage.	MT	R	A	L	+/-	0	Significance of any effects on biodiversity will depend on the level of provision proposed, what technologies are proposed and the location. Option 1 may adversely affect biodiversity directly through installation of technologies but could benefit biodiversity in the long term through climate change mitigation.	Large scale renewable energy development should ensure that biodiversity is protected and enhanced through appropriate ecological assessment and mitigation measures. Adverse impacts on designated areas and protected/notable species should be avoided.
2. Land and soil	No.	LT	I	A	L	-/?	0	Renewable energy installations not likely to lead to significant loss of Greenfield and/or agricultural land. Effects will depend on level of provision, type of technologies and location.	Large scale renewable energy development should be located on brownfield sites wherever possible.
3. Waste management	No.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
4. Water resources	No.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	0	Option 1 more likely to improve water availability and reduce water scarcity through climate change mitigation.	Consideration of prohibiting certain technologies where there may be a possibility of impacts on watercourses and areas with

Core Policy 42: Standalone renewable energy installations Options 1-2 (see section 5.44 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
									designations such as groundwater source protection zones.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	0	Option 1 more likely to reduce flood risk through climate change mitigation.	It may be possible to locate some renewable energy installations eg wind turbines, in areas of flood risk. This would need further investigation.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No.	MT	R	A	L	+/-	0	Option 1 - potential impacts from noise, shadow flicker, odour etc. Will depend on type of technology and location, and proximity to populated areas. Possible benefits for air quality from cleaner energy sources.	All potential mitigation measures should be investigated to reduce effects on amenity.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	+	-	Positive impacts for Option 1 against this objective in terms of mitigating climate impacts. Option 2 will not. However this policy alone will not make a significant difference to worldwide climate change, particularly considering the low level of renewable energy installations currently in Wiltshire.	Rather than supporting and encouraging renewable energy proposals as they come forward, a more proactive approach could be taken if the current low levels of renewable energy output in Wiltshire are to be significantly increased.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No.	LT	R	A	L	-/?	0	Option 1 could have adverse impacts on heritage assets. Dependent on type of technology, location etc Details of actual proposals would be needed to assess further.	Proposals for large scale renewable energy development should ensure that adverse impacts on important heritage assets (whether designated or not) are avoided or reduced. The location of such installations will require careful consideration.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes. Option 2	LT	R	B	L	+	--	Option 2 could have significant adverse impacts on urban and rural landscapes, depending on type of technology, location and landscape quality etc Details of actual proposals would be needed to assess further. Not addressing this issue through	Proposals for large scale renewable energy development should ensure that adverse impacts on designated and locally important landscapes are avoided or reduced. This is addressed through Core Policy 42. The location of such installations will require

Core Policy 42: Standalone renewable energy installations Options 1-2 (see section 5.44 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								policy may lead to development in inappropriate areas that could be very damaging to landscapes. Much of Wiltshire located in areas of important landscape designations.	careful consideration.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No.	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No.	LT	R	A	L	-/?	0	Option 1 potential health and amenity impacts, especially if wind turbines located close to populated areas.	All potential mitigation measures should be investigated to reduce effects on amenity.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No.	LT	R	A	L	?	0	Option 1 – potential quality of life impacts on residents, particularly if living in close proximity to installations?	All potential mitigation measures should be investigated to reduce effects on amenity.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	No effects envisaged,	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	0	Option 1 may increase opportunities for increasing skills in the area of renewable energy technology.	If a proactive approach taken there could be significant potential for increasing skills and employment opportunities in Wiltshire in this field.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-/?	0	Potential impacts if renewable installations leads to increased transport movements eg biomass generators, anaerobic digestion plants	Particular types of technology that will generate traffic should be located in proximity to the strategic road network and consider ways of reducing road transport eg rail freight, and reduce impacts on rural roads.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Option 1, depending on level of provision, will provide some benefits for local economy and employment opportunities.	If a proactive approach taken there could be significant potential for increasing skills and employment opportunities in Wiltshire in this field.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	0	Option 1, depending on level of provision, will provide some benefits for local economy and employment opportunities.	If a proactive approach taken there could be significant potential for increasing skills and employment opportunities in Wiltshire in this field.

## Core Policy 43: Providing affordable homes

Core Policy 43: Providing affordable homes Options 1-3 (see section 5.45 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Location of housing is covered in other Core Strategy policies. Neutral effects. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
<b>7. Climatic</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against	None

Core Policy 43: Providing affordable homes Options 1-3 (see section 5.45 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
factors									this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	
8. Historic environment	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Options will have neutral impacts against this objective. Policy relates to provision of affordable housing and tenure. Effects will depend on location of development not level of provision.	None
10. Housing	Yes Option 3	LT	R	B	L	+	-/?	++/?	Existing policies require an inconsistent and varied level of provision which have some benefits in securing affordable housing. Option 2 (depending on requirement which is not known) may make some developments unviable which could reduce provision of housing overall. Option 3 would help achieve other objectives and achieve a balanced level of housing provision through a requirement for 40% affordable housing 15 or more dwellings and 25% on 4 to 14 dwellings.	There are uncertainties regarding Option 3. The 'Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Draft Report December 2011' produced by Adams Integra supports an affordable housing proportion of 40% for the strategic sites. It recommends that the Council considers the adoption of a single affordable housing target of 40% for all sites of 5 units and above, on the assumption of either affordable rent, or assuming social rent at no more than 60% of the affordable provision. At present the Council requires 25% on 4-14 dwellings.
11. Healthy communities	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	+	Option 2 (depending on requirement which is not known) may make provision of other essential social infrastructure unachievable. Increased provision of affordable housing without corresponding healthcare, open	None.



Core Policy 43: Providing affordable homes										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.45 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									space, community facilities etc not acceptable.	
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+/-	+	All options propose affordable housing provision which can reduce social exclusion and provide modern housing for more people. Option 2 mixed impacts as provision of other social infrastructure may be prevented.	Policy needs to ensure the right mix of type, tenure and size to meet the needs of all members of the community. It must not prevent provision of other social infrastructure. Policy should provide clear link to Lifetime Homes policy.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-/?	+	Indirect benefits. Right level of provision will achieve other objectives. Option 2 may prevent new community facilities but the effect on existing facilities is uncertain.	Important to find correct balance. Requirement must not be so onerous that provision of social infrastructure is unachievable.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	-/?	0	Options 1 and 3 neutral effects. Option 2 may either make some new housing unviable so restricting new housing for skilled workers OR may lead to under supply of larger housing for skilled workers and their families.	Policy needs to ensure the right mix of type, tenure and size to meet the needs of all members of the community. Need to attract higher earning families to Wiltshire also.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	0	Option 2 may either make some new housing unviable so restricting new housing for skilled workers OR may lead to under supply of larger housing for skilled workers and their families.	Policy needs to ensure the right mix of type, tenure and size to meet the needs of all members of the community.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	+	Option 2 may not provide sufficient housing for higher earners. Adverse effects on local economy and may make Wiltshire less attractive place to work for skilled workers.	Policy needs to ensure the right mix of type, tenure and size to meet the needs of all members of the community.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	+	Option 2 may not provide sufficient housing for higher earners. Adverse effects on local economy and may make Wiltshire less attractive place to work for skilled workers.	Policy needs to ensure the right mix of type, tenure and size to meet the needs of all members of the community.

## Core Policy 44 – Rural exceptions sites

Core Policy 44: Rural exceptions sites Options 1-3 (see section 5.46 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	-	Limited effects envisaged through all options. Policy promotes housing development. Some likely to be on Greenfield land.	A focus on infill and brownfield sites within this policy may reduce effects on biodiversity.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-	-	Some loss of Greenfield land envisaged but not significant. No differentiation between options. Long-term and irreversible effects.	Policy requires development within, adjoining or closely related to the existing settlement and accessible to employment and services. A focus on infill and brownfield sites within this policy would produce greater benefits.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	No particular effects envisaged.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0/-	0/-	0/-	Possible limited effects. Small-scale development likely may have limited effects on water resources and some increase in water demand.	Policy states 'environmental considerations will not be compromised'. This must include consideration of water resources including watercourses, groundwater, abstraction, demand and flood risk.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0/-	0/-	0/-	Possible limited effects. Small-scale development likely. Will depend on location.	Policy states 'environmental considerations will not be compromised'. This must include consideration of flood risk. Development should avoid FZ 2/3. Appropriate surface water management incl SuDS.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	-	Limited development likely but in rural areas. Will increase air, noise and light pollution. Increase in traffic likely.	Policy requires development within, adjoining or closely related to the existing settlement and accessible to employment and services which will reduce need to travel. Development preferable within settlement boundaries and where good public transport services in place.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	-	-	Some additional emissions likely but not significant.	Policy requires development within, adjoining or closely related to the existing settlement and accessible to employment and services which

Core Policy 44: Rural exceptions sites										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.46 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										will reduce need to travel.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	-	Limited development likely. Effects will depend on location and size of development, design standards. Some limited effects possible.	Policy states 'its scale and type is appropriate to the nature of the settlement it adjoins and will respect the character and setting of that settlement'. Development must avoid impacting on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	-	Limited development likely. Effects will depend on location and size of development, design standards.	There must be particular care taken with any development likely to affect a designated landscape or townscape area. Detailed landscape assessment may be required for each proposal.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Option 3	LT	R	A	L	+	+	++	Benefits from all options. Option 3 most likely to meet wider range of housing needs including market and affordable housing to meet local need. Option 3 allows cross-subsidy where viability issues.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	+	Benefits from all options in terms of housing provision to meet local need, esp affordable provision. Environmental protection included. Options 1 and 2 may not achieve same level of affordable provision.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	+	Option 3 more likely to meet local affordable need, allowing people to stay in their communities, reducing social exclusion. Options 1 and 2 unlikely to meet local affordable need.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	+	Policy requires development within, adjoining or closely related to the existing settlement and accessible to employment and services. Option 1 is	None.

Core Policy 44: Rural exceptions sites										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.46 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									not a consistent approach and may not achieve benefits in this regard.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+	+	No significant provision likely but Options 2 and 3 will locate development close to existing schools within the settlement.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	-	-	-	All 3 options likely to increase traffic somewhat. Rural public transport services poor.	Development should be promoted in larger villages that have some public transport services and located where people can walk to a bus stop.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	+	Options 1 and 2 less likely to meet local need. People will need to move to larger towns. Rural economy benefits from allowing people, especially young families, to stay in community.	None.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	-	-	+	Options 1 and 2 less likely to meet local need. People will need to move to larger towns. Rural businesses benefit from allowing people, especially young families, to stay in community. Skills retention. Pubs, village stores benefit.	None.

## Core Policy 45: Meeting Wiltshire's housing needs

Core Policy 45: Meeting housing needs Options 1-3 (see section 5.47 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None

<b>Core Policy 45: Meeting housing needs</b>										
<b>Options 1-3 (see section 5.47 of main report for details of options)</b>										
<b>Sustainability appraisal objective</b>	<b>Are significant effects likely?</b>	<b>Assessment of effects</b>				<b>Significance</b>			<b>Justification and evidence</b>	<b>Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>Op 1</b>	<b>Op 2</b>	<b>Op 3</b>		
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered. Effects more likely through policies detailing location of development.	None
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes – option 3.	LT	R	A	L	-	+	++	Part of objective is to ensure the provision of a range of house types and sizes are delivered to meet the needs of all sectors of the community. Option 1 may not deliver this as house builders may deliver the house types more aligned to their profit than the needs of communities. Option 2 may not meet specific needs in individual areas due to the large size of Wiltshire. Option 3 represents the most sustainable option which should deliver the needs of local communities on geographically smaller basis.	None
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No.	LT	R	A	L	-	+	+	Option 1 would not be likely to provide the range of housing to meet the needs of all in the community. This could result in increased social exclusion.	None
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>15. Transport</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>16. Economy</b>	No - few impacts envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged. Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	None
<b>17. Employment</b>	No - few	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None

Core Policy 45: Meeting housing needs Options 1-3 (see section 5.47 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
	impacts envisaged.								Policy aims to ensure correct mix in housing is delivered.	

### Core Policy 46 – Meeting the needs of Wiltshire’s vulnerable and older people

Core Policy 46: Meeting the needs of Wiltshire’s vulnerable and older people Options 1-3 (see section 5.48 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2	Op3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	-	-	Each option promotes housing and this may have adverse effects against this objective. Option 1 (market dictates) may result in much less specialist provision and therefore less impacts.	Policy states that exceptions will be considered provided that ‘environmental considerations will not be compromised’. This could make clearer what the environmental considerations are. In particular, designated wildlife sites should not be adversely affected directly or indirectly unless other sustainability benefits outweigh any impacts and this can be demonstrated.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	0	-	-	Each option promotes housing and this may have adverse effects against this objective in terms of loss of Greenfield land. Option 1 (market dictates) may result in much less specialist provision and therefore less impacts.	Policy refers to ‘provision in suitable locations’ and then ‘sustainable locations’. This could be made clearer so that new development is located where loss of Greenfield land is reduced and where there is good access to services, facilities and public transport to enable older people to remain independent.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	No effects envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	-	-	Policy options promote new housing development. Some increases in water	None.

Core Policy 46: Meeting the needs of Wiltshire's vulnerable and older people Options 1-3 (see section 5.48 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2	Op3		
									demand likely and/or impacts on water resources depending on development location.	
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	-	Policy options promote new housing development. Likely some will take place in locations where flood risk may be an issue.	Further clarification in policy of 'provision in suitable locations' and 'sustainable locations'. Consideration of the sequential approach to the location of developments, i.e. by placing developments in Flood Zone 1 first.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	-/0	-/0	Limited adverse effects Options 2 and 3. Level of additional provision through implementing this policy unlikely to contribute to poor air quality or other forms of pollution overall.	Policy promotes development within principal settlements and market towns which will allow greater opportunities for public transport usage and walking to local facilities.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/0	-/0	Level of additional provision through implementing this policy unlikely to contribute to climate change	Policy promotes development within principal settlements and market towns which will allow greater opportunities for public transport usage and walking to local facilities.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	-	-	Each option promotes housing and this may have adverse effects against this objective. Option 1 (market dictates) may result in much less specialist provision and therefore less impacts.	Further clarification in policy of 'provision in suitable locations' and 'sustainable locations'. New development should avoid adverse effects on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	-	-	Each option promotes housing and this may have adverse effects against this objective. Policy requires development in 'suitable' and 'sustainable' locations within settlements and this will help mitigate impacts.	Further clarification in policy of 'provision in suitable locations' and 'sustainable locations'.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes Options 2 and 3	LT	R	C	L	+	++/?	++/?	Option 3 positively addresses a recognised need for specialist accommodation. Some concern over removal of requirement for Lifetime	Option 2 – setting targets and requirements for housing to meet the needs of vulnerable and older people on a Wiltshire wide basis may give significant benefits. It will depend on how



Core Policy 46: Meeting the needs of Wiltshire's vulnerable and older people Options 1-3 (see section 5.48 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2	Op3		
									Homes. Option 1 may not meet needs. Option 2 may place undue viability constraints on developers that results in lower levels of housing provision overall.	onerous the target or requirement is. Evidence based targets should not unduly constrain developers.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	+	+	Options directly address health and wellbeing among older people. Level of provision unlikely to lead to significant improvements in human health or provision of healthcare facilities.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	+	+	Options directly address the needs of older people. Specialist accommodation can reduce social exclusion and increase accessibility to services and facilities. Lifetime Homes can also allow people to stay at home and within their communities longer.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+	+	Options will increase accessibility to a range of services/facilities particularly if accommodation located in larger settlements. Promoting development in principal settlements and market towns may disadvantage those living in rural areas.	Policy states that accommodation would normally be provided in principal settlements and market towns unless exceptional circumstances. The need for accommodation in smaller settlements may not be 'exceptional' and would allow older people in more rural areas to stay closer to home. Consideration of amended policy wording.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	No effects envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	-	-	Policy promotes development which will have some impacts depending on location and amount but not	None.

<b>Core Policy 46: Meeting the needs of Wiltshire's vulnerable and older people</b>										
<b>Options 1-3 (see section 5.48 of main report for details of options)</b>										
<b>Sustainability appraisal objective</b>	<b>Are significant effects likely?</b>	<b>Assessment of effects</b>				<b>Significance</b>			<b>Justification and evidence</b>	<b>Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>Op1</b>	<b>Op2</b>	<b>Op3</b>		
									considered significant. Policy supports development in existing settlements which will reduce impacts.	
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	No specific effects envisaged.	None.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	+	Some employment benefits. Specialist accommodation.	None.

<b>South Wilts Core Strategy</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects</b>
<b>LIFETIME HOMES</b>		<b>Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)</b>
<b>Sustainability Appraisal objective</b>		
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	+	Lifetime Home standards enable elderly people or those with disabilities to remain in their homes through the incorporation of 16 design features which enable easy adaptation of properties to wheelchair use. Therefore people are able to stay in their communities and are not forced to move to find suitable accommodation. The policy particularly addresses the needs of the high elderly population in the District. Although only a small amount of development will be permitted in the smaller settlements, there is risk that elderly people who can no longer drive may become isolated in more rural communities which do not have extensive public transport to allow easy access to a wider range of facilities. Generally very positive for this objective and will have immediate short term effect as well as long term effect but the comments above should be considered.
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	+	As noted above the policy addresses the long term needs of the aging population and takes positive action to ensure that appropriate accommodation is available. It is recognised that incorporating the required design features does bring about additional costs but this is offset by the saving on the need for more expensive adaptations and the increased marketability of the property. Positive effect although the policy may encourage people to stay in accommodation which is larger than required to meet their needs which may affect the flow of family sized accommodation available.

<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	+	The provision of appropriate accommodation means that people lead a more stress-free life through not having to cope with difficult stairs or sanitary arrangements. A positive effect for health.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	+	Full wheelchair access and the provision of dedicated wheelchair size parking means that people are able to leave their homes to access facilities. Positive effect.
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	-	Potential for minor long term adverse effect. Enabling people to stay in their existing homes may mean that people remain in houses considerably larger than required to meet their needs e.g. one or two older people in a four bedroom house. Whilst this is entirely a matter of freedom of choice, it could lead to energy consumption which is high for two people and the policy may stop moves into smaller accommodation with lower energy demands.
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	0	Neutral effect

<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	+	Development to Lifetime Homes standards is encompassed in the Code for Sustainable Homes and full compliance is mandatory to achieve zero carbon rating. It is therefore considered to be an important part of achieving sustainable high quality development. Positive effect.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	0	Neutral effect

### Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers

Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers Options 1-3 (see section 5.49 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	-	-	-/?	It is not clear geographically where the pitches may be located. If the pitches are located on land that has a value for biodiversity this could be eroded. Option 1 would logically have the less impact with respect to biodiversity as this would take up less land, however sites could be provided away from biodiversity sites.	When allocating sites, direct pitches away from sites of biodiversity importance. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	-/?	-/?	-/?	The policy states 'In selecting a sustainable location, preference will	Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a

Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.49 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									generally be given to previously developed land or a vacant and derelict site in need of renewal'. As many pitches as possible should be directed towards previously developed land. Effects will depend on location and size of site.	Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	Uncertain	MT	R	A	L	?	?	?	Few if any impacts envisaged.	When allocating and designing new sites ensure waste infrastructure is included to assist in minimising waste production. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	L	?	?	?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Effects will depend on location and size of site.	Few impacts are envisaged however when identifying gypsy and traveller sites it needs to be ensured that they are directed away from areas of risk to water resources. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	L	?	?	?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Effects will depend on location and size of sites.	Few impacts are envisaged, however when allocating sites any future policy needs to ensure that the sequential test in PPS25 is followed. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to

Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.49 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	L	?	?	-/?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Although by its very nature of providing for more pitches option 3 has the possibility of a greater impact.	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites environmental pollution needs to be considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	B	L	?	?	-/?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Although by its very nature of providing for more pitches option 3 has the possibility of a greater impact.	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites climatic factors needs to be considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	U	?	?	-/?	Few if any impacts envisaged. Although by its very nature of providing for more pitches option 3 has the possibility of a greater impact. Effects will depend on location and size of site.	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites Wiltshire's historic environment needs to be considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Uncertain	LT	I	A	L	?	?	-/?	Uncertain impact as policy does not allocate site. However, by its very nature of providing for more pitches option 3 has the possibility of a greater impact. Effects will depend on location and	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites Wiltshire's landscape needs to be considered and any impact minimised. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to

Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers										
Options 1-3 (see section 5.49 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									size of site.	establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>10. Housing</b>	Yes option 3	LT	I	A	L	+	+	++	Policy provides housing for the gypsy and traveller community. Option 3 would potentially deliver pitches needed for the future to greater effect as option 1 and 2 only delivers those pitches needed to 2011.	Option 3 would provide for greater need of the gypsy and traveller community especially considering the additional pitch requirements in the amended policy.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	U	0	0	+	The policy provides for the number of pitches needed by the Gypsy and Traveller community. Option 3 greater benefits.	When designing the layout of new sites, health should be considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	Yes option 3.	LT	I	A	L	+	+	++	The policy provides for the housing needs of the gypsy and traveller community and therefore promotes more inclusive and self contained communities.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	L	?	?	?	Uncertain impact as policy does not allocate sites.	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites access to community facilities needs to be considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	Uncertain	LT	R	A	U	?	?	-/?	Uncertain impact as policy does not allocate sites. However, by its very	Impact uncertain, however when allocating sites transport issues needs to be

Core Policy 47: Meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers Options 1-3 (see section 5.49 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									nature of providing for more pitches option 3 has the possibility of a greater impact.	considered. Further sustainability appraisal work will be required as part of the development of a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD to establish effects of individual proposed sites.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	U	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	U	0	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None.

### Core Policy 48 – Supporting rural life

Core Policy 48: Supporting rural life Options 1-2 (see section 5.50 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures	
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2			
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Benefits likely as development proposals will be supported where they meet sustainable development objectives and will not be detrimental to the local environment. Policy promotes re-use of existing buildings and sustainable farming and food production.	Other Core Strategy policies promote protection and enhancement of biodiversity but this policy could address the need for development in rural areas to avoid adversely affecting biodiversity assets and to ensure all development leads to overall enhancement.	
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	+	-	Policy promotes re-use of existing buildings and rural employment provision that is within or adjacent to named villages. A no policy approach may lead to development in less sustainable locations.	A focus on brownfield sites within or adjacent to named villages would maximise benefits against this objective, and avoidance of developing higher quality agricultural land.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific issues against this objective.	None.	
<b>4. Water</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Relatively small amount of new development	Policy requires development to meet	



Core Policy 48: Supporting rural life									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.50 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
resources								envisaged. Some benefits from policy promoting development within or adjacent to named villages.	sustainable development objectives and this will include protecting and enhancing water resources and water efficiency promotion.
5. Flood risk	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0	Policy is not allocating new development but likely benefits from promoting development within or adjacent to named villages.	Flood risk addressed in other Core Strategy policies. All development should be located in FZ1.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Promoting development within or adjacent to named villages more likely to address likely main cause or poor air quality – transport. A no policy approach may lead to development in less sustainable locations.	This policy should address public transport services in rural areas. Key issue for Wiltshire. Policy refers to ‘improving accessibility between towns and villages’ but does not refer to need to improve public transport.
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	R	B	L	+	-	Promoting development within or adjacent to named villages more likely to reduce emissions levels. Few impacts envisaged.	None.
8. Historic environment	No	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	Effects dependent on where development takes place and type of development. Policy promotes re-use of existing buildings and sensitive re-use. Wiltshire has many important old agricultural buildings and historic village centres.	Specific reference needed to new development protecting and enhancing heritage assets and their setting. Particularly relevant where new development takes place in proximity to heritage assets or where conversion of old buildings proposed.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Benefits although policy does not specifically refer to landscape quality. It does require protection of the countryside, re-use of existing buildings and development within or adjacent to named villages which will reduce landscape impacts.	Wiltshire has a high quality landscape with AONB covering much of it. This policy could make specific reference to protecting this unique asset.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Policy supports conversion of redundant buildings for residential use and improved accessibility. This allows opportunities for housing provision in rural areas.	None.
11. Healthy	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-	Benefits in terms of supporting employment	None.

Core Policy 48: Supporting rural life									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.50 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
communities								opportunities which can improve health and wellbeing. Policy supports infrastructure provision to increase accessibility and reduce social exclusion, isolation and deprivation which can all have adverse health impacts.	
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	A	L	+	-	Benefits in terms of supporting employment opportunities which can help resolve poverty and deprivation issues. Policy supports infrastructure provision to increase accessibility and reduce social exclusion, isolation and deprivation.	None.
13. Community facilities	Yes Option 1	MT	R	A	L	++	-	Poor accessibility by public transport is a key issue for Wiltshire, a rural county. Policy does address improving transport infrastructure but need greater focus on public transport. Policy supports community ownership of local shops, pubs and other services and provision of new shops is encouraged.	None.
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	A	L	+	0	Policy promotes employment development, farm diversification and improved services/facilities which will help retain and improve skills in rural areas.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	No significant effects through policy. Policy promotes improved accessibility and development within or adjacent to named villages. Policy does not allocate land for development.	This policy should address public transport services in rural areas. Key issue for Wiltshire. Policy refers to 'improving accessibility between towns and villages' but does not refer to need to improve public transport.
16. Economy	Yes	LT	R	C	L	++	--	Significant benefits from supporting and encouraging employment opportunities, infrastructure, community ownership, new shops and exception sites. Relying on other Core Strategy policies will	None.

Core Policy 48: Supporting rural life Options 1-2 (see section 5.50 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								not address the rural economy specifically and may lead to significant loss of employment to larger centres.	
17. Employment	Yes	LT	R	C	L	++	--	Significant benefits from supporting and encouraging employment opportunities, infrastructure, community ownership, new shops and exception sites. Relying on other Core Strategy policies will not address employment in rural areas but will focus it on larger settlements. May lead to significant loss of employment to larger centres.	None.

### Core Policy 49: Protection of services and community facilities

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This includes a review of the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.51 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
1. Social inclusion for all	+	Positive impact - there are still some facilities in rural areas of South Wiltshire and it is important for rural communities that these are retained. Equally it is important to encourage the improvement and or provision of new facilities where non currently exist to act as a focus for community cohesion.
	Amended -	Wiltshire Core Strategy policy does not provide for new community services and facilities, only the protection of existing facilities. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase.
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	0	Neutral effect
3. Improve health and well being of population	+	Easy access to health and community facilities is important for both urban and rural residents particularly the elderly and those with mobility difficulties or no access to a private vehicle. This policy has the potential to

		have a positive impact on this SA objective.
	Amended -	Wiltshire Core Strategy policy does not provide for new community services and facilities, only the protection of existing facilities. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	++	This policy will have long-term positive impacts on this SA objective.
	Amended -	Wiltshire Core Strategy policy does not provide for new community services and facilities, only the protection of existing facilities. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase.
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect (See policy 49 for sport and leisure facilities)
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	+	Retention or provision of community facilities in areas with poor public transport links will reduce reliance on the private vehicle for day to day needs and leisure activities and will therefore reduce transport emissions.
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	+	Retention or provision of local community facilities will enable access by walking or cycling. Positive impact.
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	+	New community facilities can be provided in rural buildings which no longer fit their original purpose <sup>8</sup> .
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by</b>	0	Neutral effect

<b>flooding, promote water efficiency</b>		
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect - subject to other plan policy
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	0	Neutral effect - subject to other plan policy
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	0	Neutral effect - subject to other plan policy
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	0	Neutral effect - subject to other plan policy
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	Neutral effect - the scale of development will not be such as to undermine the local service centres.
	Amended -	Wiltshire Core Strategy policy does not provide for new community services and facilities, only the protection of existing facilities. This will lead to adverse effects in the medium to long term as populations grow and pressures on existing services and facilities increase.
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	0	The policy requires that facilities or extensions or in keeping with the scale of the settlement and adjacent to existing buildings.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	0	Neutral effect

## Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and geodiversity

Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes.	LT	R	B	L	-	+/?	++/?	++	<p>Current saved policies offer weak protection of biodiversity assets and are inconsistent across former district areas.</p> <p>Option 2 may have some benefits but will depend on ability to consistently amend and update spatial mapping. Some important areas may be outside the boundary on a map due to outdated data and difficult to defend against inappropriate development.</p> <p>Options 3 &amp; 4 likely to offer stronger protection than current policies.</p> <p>Option 4 in particular would give significant benefits as it would not allow damage, loss or disturbance to any biodiversity interests.</p>	<p>No significant adverse effects are likely from any option. They all promote protection of the natural environment to varying degrees.</p> <p>To improve beneficial effects, the spatial mapping with Option 2 would require more resources to allow regular updating of maps which may not be possible at present.</p> <p>All policies should address the potential impacts of climate change in terms of loss/changes to habitat and effects on species, but also potential benefits to biodiversity from a changing climate. Policies should include protection of SACs and also promote protection and enhancement of the remaining fragments of ancient woodland which provide an important habitat.</p>
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No.	LT	I	C	L	0	0	0	-/?	<p>Options 1-3 unlikely to influence whether development built on Greenfield or brownfield land, or housing densities.</p> <p>Option 4 requires very strong protection and enhancement of biodiversity. This would mean more land required and could make some developments unviable. However, could have the effect of increasing densities.</p>	<p>To benefit this objective, policies need to consider the viability of development – viability may be affected if measures too strong.</p> <p>Promotion of protection and enhancement of biodiversity on brownfield sites should be considered, within new development.</p>
<b>3. Waste</b>	No.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	0	0	<p>Few if any impacts envisaged.</p>	None.

Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
<b>management</b>											
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes	LT	R	B	L	-	0/+	+	++	Biodiversity protection and enhancement can help protect the quality of watercourses and have benefits for mitigating and adapting to climate change. Current policy shown to lead to damage/loss of biodiversity which may also adversely water quality in rivers and other water bodies.	Effects of policy on water bodies and ability to influence water quality should be specifically addressed in policy or supporting text. Incorporation of measures such as SuDS can benefit water quality above and below ground.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	-	0/+	+/?	+/?	Biodiversity protection and enhancement can help reduce or prevent risk of flooding by slowing water infiltration and surface water runoff. Current policies lead to loss not gain and do not address benefits of habitat protection for reducing flood risk. Options 3 & 4 through strong, effective protection and enhancement will help reduce flood risk.	The potential for this policy to address climate change mitigation through measures such as SuDS but also habitat protection that can reduce surface water runoff should be acknowledged in policy or supporting text.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes.	LT	R	B	L	-	+	++/?	++	Options 3 and 4 will give greater protection and enhancement than existing policies, helping to improve air quality and reduce effects of noise and light pollution that can be adversely affected by development and traffic. Option 3 is dependent on development contributions – development is often the cause of	In Wiltshire most problems concerning air quality arise from traffic, particularly in town centres. Noise and light pollution arise mainly from development and traffic. Mitigation should include reducing the effects of transport, often exacerbated by levels of growth, through effective sustainable transport schemes, inclusion of larger buffer zones particularly where

Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										these impacts. Option 4 likely to give greatest benefits through requirement for no loss/damage/disturbance which would require strong mitigation of any air quality, noise, light and other environmental impacts. This option may also prevent economic growth, so reducing such impacts from occurring.	sensitive areas are present and provision of alternative greenspace to reduce disturbance impacts.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+	+	It is likely that options 2-4 will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a limited way and habitat creation/enlargement could increase the benefits. However, not likely to be significant due to anticipated scale in reality, and compared with other policies concerning energy use and transport.	For benefits to be significantly increased, policy would have to require large scale habitat creation that would significantly reduce emissions, coupled with policies to reduce economic growth. Policy should give greater acknowledgement to benefits habitat creation can have for climate change adaptation.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+	+	No adverse effects from options 2-4. Current policy is not effective and therefore does not help protect or enhance heritage assets. Policies can be positive in protecting and enhancing heritage assets, particularly historic landscapes and from the effects of development.	Benefits can be increased through promoting appropriate habitat creation to specifically benefit areas of historic importance – this could be a building or landscape or conservation area etc.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes.	LT	R	B	L	-	+/?	++	++	Policies 3 & 4 in particular offer significant opportunities to enhance urban and rural landscapes through habitat protection, enhancement and creation. Biodiversity and landscape protection policies can be	Strong and effective biodiversity policy can help reduce impacts of development on landscapes through use of landscaping, buffer zones, tree planting and green infrastructure. Incorporation of measures such as SuDS and water



Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										complimentary if planned in a sensitive and appropriate way.	bodies can enhance a landscape and have important ecological benefits.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	MT	R	B	L	0	0	+	-/?	<p>Policies that enhance biodiversity, particularly within developments, can make housing schemes more desirable places to live and improve quality of life by giving access to nature.</p> <p>Option 4 is very rigid and could affect housing provision by making development unviable. This would also affect the local economy and provision of essential infrastructure.</p>	Adverse effects could be reduced by acknowledging that housing provision can lead to, and provide funding for, significant ecological gain, despite some short term loss/disturbance. Option 4 does not allow any loss or damage to occur. Option 3 policy or supporting text should further acknowledge the role that housing provision plays in providing contributions towards biodiversity and possibly provide information on the most favourable locations for development.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	+	+	-	<p>Options 2 &amp; 3 are likely to result in biodiversity gain and further protection which can have benefits for human health and wellbeing, particularly if part of a multi-functional GI network.</p> <p>Option 4 will have significant benefits for biodiversity but may make development unviable and reduce economic growth which would impact upon funding and provision of jobs, homes, healthcare and recreational facilities.</p>	The policy or supporting text should stress the important role protection of the natural environment has in promoting health and wellbeing and encouraging healthy outdoor recreation. This policy should show clear links with a GI policy that includes provision of recreational open space and encourages sport, walking and cycling that can reduce many health-related problems.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	-	+	+	-	<p>Main benefits relate to improvements in quality of life as a result of living in and giving access to a high quality natural environment.</p> <p>Option 4 may give greatest protection to biodiversity but would harm</p>	Local economic benefits can be enhanced through promoting the natural environment to attract inward investment, new residents and tourism. This will provide jobs, increase social inclusion and income levels.

Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										economic growth and therefore quality of life for local people.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	+	+	-	Possible benefits for enhancing rural facilities if increase in visitors to Wiltshire eg pubs, village shops. Option 4 may reduce economic growth and therefore reduce likelihood of provision through developer contributions,	There needs to be links between this policy and getting people actively involved in their local community, access to the countryside and things such as interpretation and information provision.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No.	LT	R	B	L	0	0	+	+/- /?	These policies may have little impact on this objective. Option 3 would further protect the natural environment and this may help attract residents and businesses to Wiltshire. Option 4 gives stronger protection – this could attract more businesses to Wiltshire or have a detrimental effect by reducing available employment land.	Policy needs to be designed to help maintain and enhance business that retains jobs and skills opportunities.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	0	+	+	These policies will not significantly influence transport or shifts in transport modes. Benefits if linked with sustainable transport routes incorporated in GI network. Option 4 could reduce economic growth and therefore reduce need to travel.	Need strong links with a GI policy that promotes walking and cycling through provision of safe and accessible routes.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	?	+	+	--	Strong protection of the natural environment can benefit the local economy by attracting businesses and attracting people who then spend money locally.	Wiltshire benefits from tourism related to its high quality natural environment. Options 2 & 3 would enhance this and would not deter economic growth. The benefits that biodiversity protection can

Core Policy 50: Biodiversity options 1-4 (see section 5.52 main report for details of options)											
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance				Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3	Op 4		
										Option 4 would make it very difficult to develop any land for economic growth and this would indirectly affect existing businesses and other services.	have for the local economy need to be further acknowledged in policy or supporting text.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	?	+	+	-	Current policies are weak and how this affects employment is unclear. Policies that give strong protection but do not significantly conflict with economic growth should benefit provision of jobs and attract businesses to Wiltshire. Option 4 may prevent land being made available for employment purposes and prevent existing employment areas from expanding.	It will be necessary to have a strong policy to protect and enhance biodiversity in Wiltshire, but that doesn't prevent economic growth. Employment land should be located so as to reduce any impacts on biodiversity assets with strong mitigation and enhancement measures in place.

### Core Policy 51: Landscape

Core Policy 51: Landscape Options 1-3 (see section 5.53 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes options 1 and 2	LT	R	B	L	++	++	-	Options 1 and 2 both offer strong landscape protection which will have significant benefits for biodiversity and protecting/enhancing wildlife habitats.	Reference to tranquillity will have increased benefits. Many habitats and species increasingly affected by noise and light pollution from urban development and transport. It is recommended that planting regimes should reflect the local landscape

Core Policy 51: Landscape Options 1-3 (see section 5.53 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
										character, and take opportunities to support biodiversity.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes option 2	LT	I	C	L	+	++	-	Option 2 would make specific reference to protection of rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural land. Although inconsistent with PPS7/PPS12, would be stronger policy against this objective.	Final policy or supporting text could make reference to benefits of strong landscape protection regarding protecting soil quality, protecting natural floodplains and promoting development on brownfield sites in town centres.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	-	Both options 1 and 2 promote strong landscape protection which will have benefits for protecting water resources and natural floodplains. Option 3 – weaker landscape protection, adverse effects.	Final policy or supporting text could make reference to benefits of strong landscape protection for climate change mitigation and adaptation – protecting water resources and reducing flood risk through reducing greenfield land take.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	-	Both options 1 and 2 promote strong landscape protection which will have benefits for reducing flood risk and protecting natural floodplains. Option 3 – weaker landscape protection may lead to greater greenfield land take.	Final policy or supporting text could make reference to benefits of strong landscape protection for climate change mitigation and adaptation – protecting water resources and reducing flood risk through reducing greenfield land take.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes option 2	MT	R	C	L	+	++	-	Reference to tranquillity very positive. Option 2 would give added protection to rural buffers, significantly reducing impacts of noise and light pollution on smaller communities that are located near to growth areas.	Strong policy required that addresses impacts of growth on rural communities, particularly issues of coalescence, noise, light and traffic increases resulting from growth.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	-	Both options 1 and 2 promote strong landscape protection which could help reduce emissions, mainly by restricting development. Benefits for climate	None.

Core Policy 51: Landscape Options 1-3 (see section 5.53 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									change adaptation. Significant benefits not likely in terms of global climate.	
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	-	Both options 1 and 2 promote strong landscape protection. Benefits for conserving and enhancing features and areas of historical and cultural value.	None.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes options 1 and 2	LT	R	C	L	++/?	++	-	Both options 1 and 2 promote strong landscape protection. Option 2 offers stronger protection due to rural buffer protection. Concerns that Option 1 will increase issues of coalescence by removing rural buffers. Option 3 – saved policies inconsistent, out-of-date and ineffective.	Acknowledgement of impacts of growth in terms of reducing local character and distinctiveness, coalescence and impacts of noise, light and traffic increases. The SLA network will need to be reviewed to identify any areas with unique characteristics that would not be adequately protected by a criteria-based approach. Further work should be undertaken to identify any such areas.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-	--	0	Stronger protection, particularly regarding rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural land may reduce land available for housing. Option 2 possibly too restrictive and will effect housing provision in main growth areas. Significance of effects would depend on actual policy wording and extent that any growth is restricted.	To promote housing growth, policy should not include “rigid local [landscape] designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas” (PPS7). Take out reference to tranquillity, rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	Uncertain	MT	R	C	L	+/-	+/-	+/-	There are health and wellbeing benefits from protecting landscapes and rural communities but also from allowing further housing and employment. All options likely to have range of limited impacts on this objective.	Policy should ensure that sufficient protection is given in the right areas but that housing and employment growth is not inappropriately restricted. Right balance between protection and recognising that growth can provide jobs, modern housing and infrastructure.

Core Policy 51: Landscape Options 1-3 (see section 5.53 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+	0	Option 2 would give further protection to rural communities by protecting rural buffers.	Protecting rural buffers can maintain or enhance the quality of life of existing local residents.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	0	Few impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	0	-	0	Option 2 may be too restrictive and may prevent some employment land provision.	Reference to tranquillity, rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural land should be removed to maximise benefits against this objective.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	+	0	Few direct impacts envisaged, although stronger landscape protection may restrict growth and lead to reduced traffic impacts.	None.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+/-	+/-	+/-	All options – benefits for tourism economy through landscape protection. Significant adverse impacts if housing/employment growth restricted through Option 2.	Right balance needs to be found between protection of Wiltshire's many valued landscapes and recognising that growth can provide economic benefits.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	-	--	0	Stronger protection, particularly reference to setting of AONBs, tranquillity and keeping rural buffers may reduce land available for employment growth. Option 2 possibly too restrictive and will effect employment provision across Wiltshire.	To promote housing growth, policy should not include "rigid local [landscape] designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas" (PPS7). Take out reference to tranquillity, rural buffers and best and most versatile agricultural.

## Core Policy 52 – Green Infrastructure

Core Policy 52: Green Infrastructure Options 1-2 (see section 5.54 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	B	L	+	++/?	Significant benefits for biodiversity through Option 1. Wiltshire GI standards are current and will significantly improve the protection and enhancement of biodiversity through development.	Some uncertainty over the requirement for major development only to be accompanied by an audit of existing GI. Smaller developments may also have significant impacts, in particular cumulative impacts of several small developments in an area.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	+	+	Both options will have benefits against this objective through retention and enhancement of open space and GI, helping to protect areas of high quality agricultural land and protecting soil quality.	None.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral impacts envisaged.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	B	L	+	++	Retention and enhancement of GI and requiring an audit of existing GI for all major development including long-term management arrangements will significantly benefit water resources, including watercourses, groundwater protection, reducing flood risk and climate change adaptation.	None
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	C	L	+	++	Retention and enhancement of GI can significantly reduce flood risk by reducing surface water runoff and incorporation of measures such as SuDS, green roofs and other more significant flood alleviation schemes.	None.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	+	Protection and enhancement can lead to long-term improvements in air quality and reduce other forms of pollution such as noise. Positive impacts on tranquillity and contaminated land	Policy or supporting text could address the importance of retaining and enhancing green spaces in town centres that can have a role in improving air quality and providing shade and

Core Policy 52: Green Infrastructure Options 1-2 (see section 5.54 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								remediation.	areas of tranquillity.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	+	Positive impact as the preservation of GI can assist in reducing climatic impacts by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and play significant role in climate change adaptation.	GI enhancement plays an important role in both mitigation and adaptation of climate change and this strong policy can help Wiltshire reduce its emissions overall whilst allowing future adaptation to warmer, drier summers and wetter winters.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	GI enhancement can have a positive role in protecting and enhancing heritage assets, including improving their setting and reducing impacts of poor air quality and climate change.	None.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	R	B	L	+	++	Significant landscape benefits. Protection and enhancement through adoption of Wiltshire GI standards.	None.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	No direct benefits but provision of GI can improve places where people live and make new development more desirable, improve amenity and quality of life.	There are indirect links between this policy and those promoting economic growth. Provision of quality GI within new developments will increase desirability and developers profits and businesses choose to locate to areas with high environmental quality.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	++	Benefits from both options but Option 1 more comprehensive. Wide range of benefits. Policy will allow opportunities for sport, recreation and leisure, walking and cycling routes. Benefits also through tranquillity, access to nature, improved air quality.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+	GI can provide recreational space and a wide range of opportunities for engagement and active citizenship, relaxation and quiet contemplation. This can be positive for increasing social inclusion and cohesion.	None
<b>13. Community</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	Possible benefits. GI will enhance viability of	None.



<b>Core Policy 52: Green Infrastructure</b>									
<b>Options 1-2 (see section 5.54 of main report for details of options)</b>									
<b>Sustainability appraisal objective</b>	<b>Are significant effects likely?</b>	<b>Assessment of effects</b>				<b>Significance</b>		<b>Justification and evidence</b>	<b>Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>Op1</b>	<b>Op2</b>		
<b>facilities</b>								community services and facilities in both towns and rural areas. Increased tourism and inward investment may result and increased access by sustainable transport routes.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	Benefits for people to access and learn about nature. Countryside access and educational opportunities for children.	None
<b>15. Transport</b>						0	+	GI network supports retention and provision of sustainable transport routes linking areas of open space and different settlements eg Cricklade Country Way, links between developments and town centres. River paths can form important walking/cycling routes.	None
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	A GI network can have positive impacts for the local economy – tourism, attracting businesses to locate in Wiltshire, inward investment.	None
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	Benefits through improving the local environment, attracting business and workforce and inward investment.	None

## Core Policy 53 – Wilts and Berks and Thames and Severn Canals

Core Policy 53: Wilts and Berks and Thames and Severn Canals Options 1-2 (see section 5.55 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No but will depend on location and work undertaken.	LT/ST	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	New policy provides greater appreciation and protection of ecological assets. Often along the historic routes of canals new habitats have developed and these are vulnerable when restoration takes place. Short-term impacts, long-term benefits.	Instead of just requiring 'consideration of impacts' this policy could require enhancement of existing assets after restoration has taken place.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	C	L	-/?	-/?	Potential loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Effects will depend on location. Not a significant issue but loss will be irreplaceable and long-term.	None.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	?	?	Policy has little or no effects against this objective.	Adequate facilities for sewage disposal and waste collection required. This could be included in policy text.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No but will depend on appropriate assessment of impacts for any proposals.	MT	R	C	L	-	+/?	Canal restoration has potential for significant impacts on water resources. Policy recognises need for assessment of impacts and this could result in benefits in the long-term.	Policy mentions 'adequate consideration' and sufficient consideration' of impacts on water resources. Further explanation needed of what evidence will be required to prove no adverse effects.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No but will depend on location and work undertaken.	LT	R	B	L	-/?	+/?	Canal restoration has potential for significant flood risk implications. Policy recognises need for assessment of impacts and this could result in benefits in the long-term.	Policy mentions 'adequate consideration' and sufficient consideration' of impacts on water resources. Further explanation needed of what evidence will be required to prove no adverse effects.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective. Canals will not lead to marked reductions in air pollution caused by traffic.	None.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.

Core Policy 53: Wilts and Berks and Thames and Severn Canals Options 1-2 (see section 5.55 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op 2		
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-	+	Benefits. Canal restoration will restore an important part of Wiltshire's heritage.	Policy could make heritage benefits clearer, including educational benefits relating to Wiltshire's industrial past etc.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	+/?	Restoration can have limited landscape impacts. Policy addresses this and requires consideration of impacts.	Policy mentions 'adequate consideration' and sufficient consideration' of impacts on landscape. Further explanation needed of what evidence will be required to prove no adverse effects.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+0	Restored canal can provide minimal opportunities for residential use. Numbers relatively small compared to Wiltshire's housing needs.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Policy recognises need to address impacts on water resources, landscape and ecology. Canal restoration will provide opportunities for healthy exercise, sustainable transport, access to nature.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Few impacts envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	-/?	+	Benefits in terms of providing opportunities for walking and cycling over short or longer distances. Access to countryside. Mainly recreational purposes – unlikely to significantly reduce traffic volumes on Wiltshire's roads.	Policy could do more to promote sustainable transport benefits and health related benefits from this policy.

Core Policy 53: Wilts and Berks and Thames and Severn Canals Options 1-2 (see section 5.55 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op 2		
16. Economy	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Limited economic benefits. Some visitors and tourism but unlikely to be significant.	None.
17. Employment	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Limited employment benefits. Some employment but unlikely to be significant.	None.

### Core Policy 54 – Cotswold Water Park

Core Policy 54: Cotswold Water Park Options 1-2 (see section 5.56 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	T	B	L	+/?	+/?	Existing and proposed CWP policies both promote recreation and leisure facilities but also biodiversity enhancement. Potential benefits but also potential conflicts. Cumulative effects in particular from many recreation/leisure proposals.	Policy requires development to contribute towards enhancement of biodiversity within the CWP. New development must not adversely affect existing biodiversity assets then provide compensatory enhancement. Existing assets must be enhanced.
2. Land and soil	No	LT	I	A	L	+	-	Existing North Wiltshire policy TM1 permits development only as conversion, farm diversification and extension to existing buildings. Proposed policy promotes recreation and leisure development - this will have adverse effects against this objective.	Proposed CWP policy should, in order to have benefits against this objective, restrict development as existing policy TM1 does. Proposed CWP policy should reiterate need to focus new development within existing settlements, making use of existing buildings where necessary.
3. Waste management	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific effects envisaged.	None.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	B	L	+	-	Option 2 in combination with proposed CS tourist policy will lead to an increased amount of development and recreation/leisure activity in the countryside. Likely	Proposed policy requires development to demonstrate high levels of sustainability; this could refer specifically to water efficiency. Also reference to important water habitats which could be

Core Policy 54: Cotswold Water Park Options 1-2 (see section 5.56 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								increased water demand and impacts on existing water resources.	adversely affected by increased development and disturbance.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	Option 2 potential adverse effects as increased development likely in this area.	Flood risk known issue in CWP. New development in the CWP will need to be planned carefully with this potentially changing flood risk in mind in order to avoid locating development in areas at risk. Increasing flood risk is also an issue in relation to any further hard structure developed around the lakes, particularly in the floodplain; development will therefore also need to be carefully planned to ensure that it does not contribute to flooding problems in this area.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	Potential effects likely through traffic increases, noise and decreased tranquillity through a more permissive development policy.	Policy should focus new development at existing settlements where public transport services may be better. This may also reduce likelihood of increased noise and tranquillity loss resulting from development in open countryside.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	Increased development likely and potentially increased emissions despite promotion of sustainable building design.	Policy should focus new development at existing settlements, reducing need to travel and where public transport services may be better. Existing policy restricts tourism development to conversion, farm diversification and extension to existing buildings – this would reduce effects against this objective.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-/?	More permissive policy for new development. Existing policy silent re heritage. Policy recognises heritage importance of CWP area but tourism policy will permit development 'where facilities are in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction'.	Location of new development and design appropriateness are key issues. Policy does require protection and enhancement of built heritage but development more likely in areas of open countryside.
<b>9. Rural and</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	-/?	Proposed policy less restrictive and	North Wilts policy TM1 permits new development

Core Policy 54: Cotswold Water Park Options 1-2 (see section 5.56 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
urban landscapes								increased landscape impacts likely despite requirement to 'strengthen the local landscape character and engender a sense of place. This is mostly due to CS tourism policy.	where conversion, farm diversification and extension to existing buildings. This approach for tourist related development would reduce likely landscape impacts and impacts relating to noise, light and tranquillity.
10. Housing	No	LT	R	B	L	-	+	Proposed new policy does not promote new housing but is strongly linked to CS tourism policy which would allow tourist accommodation 'where facilities are in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction'. This would include CWP.	None. Policy focuses on sports, leisure and recreation based development.
11. Healthy communities	Yes Option2	MT	R	B	L	+	++	Policy strongly promotes a range of sport, leisure and recreational activities which will significantly increase opportunities for healthy exercise including walking, cycling and increased accessibility to the area.	None.
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	MT	R	B	L	-	+/?	Proposed policy offers opportunities for increased accessibility, more jobs and local economic growth, biodiversity and landscape enhancement. Some uncertainty over impacts on local residents eg increased traffic, but positive overall.	None.
13. Community facilities	Yes Option2	LT	R	B	L	-	++	Policy promotes an increased range of leisure and recreational facilities and states desire to transform the area to an informal recreation and leisure resource for Wiltshire residents and visitors in line with the key objectives of the Cotswold Water Park Vision and Implementation Plan.	There are uncertainties over impacts of level of development which could take place away from existing settlements. If development was permitted (unless exceptionally) only in existing settlements this would increase the viability of businesses and services/facilities in those settlements.
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	B	L	0	+	Benefits from employment in the CWP area.	None.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	B	L	0	-	Increased development likely and visitor	Policy should focus new development at existing

Core Policy 54: Cotswold Water Park Options 1-2 (see section 5.56 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								numbers. Increased traffic volumes on local roads. Acknowledged issue in the CWP.	settlements where public transport services may be better. This may also reduce likelihood of increased noise and tranquillity loss resulting from traffic increases in the open countryside.
<b>16. Economy</b>	Yes Option2	LT	R	B	L	0	++/?	Support for sport, leisure and recreational activities will lead to significant economic growth in local area, visitor numbers increasing, more jobs and supporting existing businesses.	Growth will need to be linked with strong environmental protection because it is the landscape, biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area that will attract visitors and revenue.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	+	Support for sport, leisure and recreational activities will lead to employment growth and help support existing businesses.	Growth will need to be linked with strong environmental protection because it is the landscape, biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area that will attract visitors and revenue.

## Core Policy 55 - Air Quality

Core Policy 55: Air Quality Options 1-2 (see section 5.57 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	MT	R	C	L	+	-	Policy will lead to improved air quality across the county with beneficial effects on biodiversity. Not addressing air quality through policy may lead to a worse situation that could adversely affect biodiversity.	Policy should specifically address developments that are likely to significantly increase traffic volumes and where this could adversely affect sensitive wildlife habitats, especially designated areas.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	This policy may lead to development in more sustainable locations that encourage urban regeneration and located within or	Policy would generate more benefits if it promoted mixed-use development that can reduce the need to travel and in locations that

Core Policy 55: Air Quality Options 1-2 (see section 5.57 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								adjacent to settlements.	can take advantage of existing services and facilities and enhance urban regeneration.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific issues envisaged.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	-	Policy will lead to improved air quality with benefits for climate change mitigation. Benefits for protecting water resources.	None.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Policy will lead to improved air quality with benefits for climate change mitigation. Future effects of climate change include increased flood risk.	None.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Benefits likely through addressing this issue through policy rather than having no policy. However, there are ways this policy could be improved to enhance future benefits further. This policy will only partially address emissions from future development and will not deal with current emissions.	Further benefits likely if policy further addresses main cause of poor air quality ie transport. Development should make significant investment in sustainable transport modes and be located where there are existing public transport services. Mixed-use development and excellent walking/cycling links to town centres should be required from all proposals as mitigation.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	+	-	Benefits likely through addressing this issue through policy rather than having no policy. No adverse effects and may mitigate greenhouse gas emissions somewhat.	Policy should recognise that climate change mitigation can result from promoting better air quality and from promoting sustainable transport choices.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Most air quality impacts and AQMAs within town centres which are often historically important and often designated as Conservation Areas. Improving air quality through policy will help protect buildings from damage.	Development should be encouraged which avoids further traffic increases, especially where AQMAs are designated, and through town centres.
<b>9. Rural and urban</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	+	-	Some benefits. Policy addresses landscaping and site layout. The policy only	Policy should better address mixed-use development and development within or



<b>Core Policy 55: Air Quality</b>									
<b>Options 1-2 (see section 5.57 of main report for details of options)</b>									
<b>Sustainability appraisal objective</b>	<b>Are significant effects likely?</b>	<b>Assessment of effects</b>				<b>Significance</b>		<b>Justification and evidence</b>	<b>Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>Op1</b>	<b>Op2</b>		
<b>landscapes</b>								permits development that can mitigate emission levels and this should promote development in more sustainable locations that can take advantage of sustainable transport modes.	adjacent to existing settlements that can benefit from sustainable transport links and proximity to town centres.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific issues envisaged.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Including a policy more likely to improve air quality and therefore health-related issues to do with poor air quality.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Some benefits in terms of quality of life and amenity especially for residents of town centres designated AQMA.	None
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific issues envisaged.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific issues envisaged.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	-	Policy mentions traffic management, routing and highway improvements. Some benefits but addressing why people travel and by what means would be far more effective at improving air quality.	Strong links required between this policy and other Core Strategy policies promoting sustainable transport. Development needs to be proactive in reducing car use and providing travel choices. Routing to avoid town centres possible but is this just shifting the problem elsewhere?
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	C	L	?	-	Clear benefits for the local economy from improving air quality, particularly in town centres, including regeneration. However policy may restrict essential economic growth. Most new development will generate additional traffic.	Some uncertainty over benefits of policy. Policy will only permit development that can demonstrate they have effectively mitigated emission levels. Wording of policy may need amending as unlikely to fully mitigate emissions.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	No specific impacts or benefits envisaged. No likely increase or decrease in employment through this policy.	None.

## Core Policy 56: Contaminated land

Core Policy 56: Contaminated land Options 1-2 (see section 5.58 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	?	?	Effects uncertain. Remediating contaminated land can have benefits for biodiversity. Some previously used sites can be of high biodiversity value. Effects dependent on site.	Brownfield sites can be important habitats (in some cases a UK BAP priority habitat – Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land). Policy could recognise the biodiversity value of certain sites and require impacts to be mitigated.
2. Land and soil	Yes Option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Policy directly addresses this objective. Option 2 would not require the level of evidence to be supplied as Option 1.	None.
3. Waste management	No	MT	R	A	L	+	0	Policy will lead to remediation of sites where waste or toxic waste may be present, removing a source of pollution.	None.
4. Water resources	No	LT	R	B	L	+	+	Both options will have benefits for reducing or preventing pollution of water resources from sites.	None.
5. Flood risk	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective. Any effects will depend on site location.	Assessment of flood risk dependent on site location. See assessment of potential strategic sites in Appendices I and J.
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	Yes Option1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	Policy directly addresses this objective. Long-term benefits likely from soil remediation and removal of pollutants that can pollute air and water resources.	None.
7. Climatic factors	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective.	None.
8. Historic environment	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Any issues dependent on site location. Effects cannot be ascertained through this policy.	None.
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	L	+	+	Both options positive effects on landscapes through site remediation.	As per objective 1 some brownfield sites can be important habitats and may have blended in with local landscape. Should be a consideration in

Core Policy 56: Contaminated land Options 1-2 (see section 5.58 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
									policy.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	MT	R	A	L	+	?	This policy is more likely to make land available for housing development. It gives potential developers information on what they need to provide. Option 2 effects uncertain.	None.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	Option 1 can have health benefits through land remediation, removing potential for pollution from soil and water resources. Option 2 effects uncertain.	None.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective.	None.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective.	None.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective.	None.
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	/	/	/	/	0	0	Neutral effects. Policy does not address this objective.	None.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	Economic benefits. Making more land available for economic growth. Option 2 effects uncertain.	None.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	+	?	Economic benefits. Making more land available for employment provision. Option 2 effects uncertain.	None.

## Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping Options 1-3 (see section 5.59 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	0	Options 1 and 3 neutral effects likely. Option 2 some benefits likely. Core policy requires 'enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment' and 'the retention and enhancement of existing important landscaping and natural features, (for example trees, hedges, banks and watercourses), in order to take opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create wildlife and recreational corridors...'	None
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	?	-/?	?	Options 1 and 3 uncertain. Option 2 – density target removed. This may lead to greater loss of Greenfield land. Some uncertainty as to extent of effects.	None
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective.	None.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	+	Option 1 - Not informed by latest good practice on designing for benefit of minimising impact on water resources. Option 2 - Better informed and more likely to take waste issues into account, requiring also a higher standard, and consistently over a wider area. Option 3 - Could have benefits in minimising water use and reducing pollution, efficiency to highest standards, but hard to quantify.	Mitigation of Option 1 would be possible by means of non planning measures, but this is not as efficient as designing in water efficiency at the outset. Reference should be made in policy to ensuring water efficiency through design.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	0	Neutral effects. This is dealt with through other Core Strategy policies and community area policies.	None

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping Options 1-3 (see section 5.59 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
6. Air quality and environmental pollution	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+	+	Some benefits could be envisaged through Options 2 and 3. Higher quality design can help reduce many forms of pollution.	None
7. Climatic factors	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	+	As per 6 above higher quality design can help reduce emissions that could lead to climate change. Proposed policy requires 'maximisation of opportunities for sustainable construction techniques, use of renewable energy sources and ensuring buildings and spaces are orientated to gain maximum benefit from sunlight and passive solar energy'.	None.
8. Historic environment	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	+	Higher quality design can positively affect the historic environment in many ways. Proposed policy requires 'being sympathetic to and conserving historic buildings and historic landscapes'.	None
9. Rural and urban landscapes	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	+	Higher quality design can have real benefits for the local landscape and townscape. Proposed policy refers to 'enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment, relating positively to its landscape setting' and 'the retention and enhancement of existing important landscaping and natural features' and 'responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting'.	None.

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping Options 1-3 (see section 5.59 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
10. Housing	Yes Option3	LT	R	C	L	0	+	--	Option 2 will benefit housing provision and housing design quality. Option 3 requires exemplar levels of design across Wiltshire. This could significantly increase house prices making many homes unaffordable and make development unviable.	None
11. Healthy communities	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	-	Options 2 is likely to have health benefits through better designed homes that are more energy and water efficient, make better use of space and which are affordable for those in need of modern housing. Options 1 neutral effects. Option 3 could make housing unaffordable.	None
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	-	Option 3 could make housing unaffordable.	None
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	-	Option 3 could increase build costs leaving less available for community facilities. It is considered to be un-enforceable as it exceeds Government guidelines.	Option 3 could conceivably be mitigated through financial incentives to offset increased costs. However this is unlikely to be forthcoming in the present financial climate.
14. Education and skills	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	-	Option 3 could increase build costs leaving less available for investment in education facilities. It is considered to be un-enforceable as it exceeds Government guidelines.	Option 3 could conceivably be mitigated through financial incentives to offset increased costs. However this is unlikely to be forthcoming in the present financial climate.
15. Transport	No	LT	R	B	L	0	0	-	Neutral impacts Options 1 and 2. Option 3, as noted above, likely to leave little available funding for other forms of essential infrastructure.	None
16. Economy	Yes Option 3	LT	R	C	L	0	+	--	Good design can aid regeneration and so have a positive effect on the local economy. However if costs are high then this can reduce viability of	Option 3 could conceivably be mitigated through financial incentives to offset increased costs. However this

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping Options 1-3 (see section 5.59 of main report for details of options)										
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance			Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2	Op 3		
									schemes, thereby potentially having the opposite effect. Option 2 is the most balanced of the options in this respect	is unlikely to be forthcoming in the present financial climate.
17. Employment	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	-	Good design can aid regeneration and so have a positive effect on the local economy and hence employment. However if costs are high then this can reduce viability of schemes, thereby potentially having the opposite effect. Option 2 is the most balanced of the options in this respect.	Option 3 could conceivably be mitigated through financial incentives to offset increased costs. However this is unlikely to be forthcoming in the present financial climate.

### Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment Options 1-2 (see section 5.60 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
1. Biodiversity	No	MT	R	A	L	0	+	Protection, conservation and enhancement of the historic environment can have beneficial biodiversity effects eg protection of bats.	None
2. Land and soil	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
3. Waste management	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
4. Water resources	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
5. Flood risk	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
6. Air quality and	No	MT	R	A	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective.	None

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.60 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
environmental pollution								Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	
7. Climatic factors	No	MT	R	B	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
8. Historic environment	Yes	LT	R	A	L	+/?	++/?	Option 1 - Existing policies promote some protection and enhancement of the historic environment but they are inconsistent across Wiltshire and derived from out-of-date evidence. Option 2 can, depending on implementation, potentially lead to significant benefits against this objective.	None
9. Rural and urban landscapes	Yes	LT	R	C	L	+/?	++	Option 1 - Existing policies promote measures likely to be beneficial in landscape terms, as heritage in Wiltshire is a key component of landscape quality in both rural and urban areas. Option 2 - Promotes greater care and more consistency over a wider area using latest guidance and best practice.	None
10. Housing	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Policy promotes the sensitive re-use of redundant and under-used historic buildings – this could have benefits for housing provision but in a limited way.	None
11. Healthy communities	No	LT	R	C	L	0	+	A more effective and consistent policy can have a wide range of health and wellbeing benefits, helping to improve the environment in which people live and improving economic and employment prospects through tourism and attracting inward investment.	None
12. Poverty and deprivation	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
13. Community facilities	No	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective. Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	None
14. Education and skills	No	MT	R	C	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective from both options. This is addressed through other Core Strategy policies.	None
15. Transport	No	MT	R	C	L	0	0	Neutral effects envisaged against this objective.	None



Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment Options 1-2 (see section 5.60 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								Policy unlikely to lead to effects against this objective.	
16. Economy	No	MT	R	C	L	0	+	Option 1 - Existing policies promote measures likely to be beneficial in economic terms, as heritage in Wiltshire is a key component of tourism and the County's attractiveness to employers. Option 2 - Promotes greater care and more consistency over a wider area using latest guidance and best practice. Likely to be more beneficial especially as latest guidance promotes use of tourism for regeneration and tourism.	Option 1 - Non statutory measures aimed at promoting heritage best practice would be possible, including grants and publications. However this is an unlikely option in the current economic climate. None needed for Option 2
17. Employment	No	MT	R	C	L	+/?	+	Option 1 - Existing policies promote measures likely to be beneficial in economic and hence employment terms, as heritage in Wiltshire is a key component of tourism and the County's attractiveness to employers. Option 2 - Promotes greater care and more consistency over a wider area using latest guidance and best practice. Likely to be more beneficial especially as latest guidance promotes use of tourism for regeneration and tourism aided job creation.	Option 1 - Non statutory measures aimed at promoting heritage best practice would be possible, including grants and publications. However this is an unlikely option in the current economic climate. None needed for Option 2

### Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting

Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting Options 1-2 (see section 5.61 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
1. Biodiversity	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Benefits for biodiversity through protection and enhancement of the wider setting which is high in biodiversity value.	Due consideration should be given to environmental impact assessment (EIA) regulations which list World Heritage Sites as among the 'sensitive areas' where lower

Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.61 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
									thresholds apply to the assessment of the need for EIA.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No	LT	I	A	L	0	+	Benefits through protection and enhancement of the wider setting from inappropriate development.	None
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Proposed policy requires development proposals to include measures to reduce the impact of traffic on the site – this may help reduce problems of noise and air quality associated with the A303, A344 and A4361.	None
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No	LT	R	B	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged.	None
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	+	++	Policy aims to protect the universal value of the combined site and thereby protecting the historic environment. Significant benefits compared to current policies.	None
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes	LT	R	C	L	+	++	Policy aims to protect the universal value of the combined site and thereby protecting the historic environment and its landscape.	Future landscape, boundary and buffer reviews may be necessary to allow for adequate protection of the OUV of the WHS and its setting.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Benefits through protecting a well-known and much loved heritage asset	None

Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites World Heritage Site and its setting Options 1-2 (see section 5.61 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Significance		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op1	Op2		
								that allows recreational opportunities within its setting and provides employment through tourism.	
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Economic benefits through tourism.	None
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	0	Few if any impacts envisaged against this objective from either option.	None
<b>15. Transport</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Proposed policy requires development proposals to include measures to reduce the impact of traffic on the site – this may help reduce problems of noise and air quality associated with the A303, A344 and A4361.	None
<b>16. Economy</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Benefits for local economy.	None
<b>17. Employment</b>	No	LT	R	A	L	0	+	Employment opportunities in local area particularly in the hospitality trade – hotels, pubs, shops etc	None

### Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport

Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport Options 1-2 (see section 5.62 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/?	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to promote sustainable transport and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. Sustainable travel provides opportunities to	Where possible new developments should be located in accessible locations where a range of sustainable transport options is available

Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.62 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, improve air quality, and reduce noise pollution that will have a positive impact on biodiversity. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to reduce the need to travel by car and raising awareness of car dependency, which provide some opportunities to enhance biodiversity.	to new residents and communities. Where required an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine the full impacts.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to maintain and selectively improve the local transport network, indicating there will be efficient and effective use of land. It also seeks to ensure that new developments are located in accessible locations that have good access to key services and facilities. <b>Option 2</b> puts emphasis on reducing the need to travel by car it does not indicate the desire to reduce land take caused because of road improvements.	New development should be in more sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links. Where required an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine the full impacts.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	+	0/?	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to influence the routing of freight within and through the county, including the transportation of waste, ensuring the least adverse effect possible. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it intends to route freight within or through the county, and therefore it is not possible to make a judgement.	By ensuring that new development is placed in accessible locations and able to take advantage of existing infrastructure and the transport networks should mean any adverse impact of waste transportation is minimal.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	?	<b>Option 1</b> will maintain the local transport network, which should take into account the need to provide adequate drainage for surface water run-off, which can cause excessive sedimentation in watercourses. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it performs in terms of water resources.	Working alongside the Environment Agency and Natural England to reduce the impact of sedimentation on watercourses.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	?	<b>Option 1</b> will maintain the local transport network, which should take account of the need to provide adequate drainage (SUDs) for surface water run-	It is important to work alongside other service providers and the business community to ensure that the predicted effects of climate

Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.62 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								off that could be pertinent given some of the predicted impacts of climate change. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it performs in terms of flood risk.	change, such as the risk of increased flooding is taken into consideration.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	C	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to improve air quality by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to improve air quality through a reduction in private car use.	New development should be located in sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links which encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	B	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions associated with transport by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private motor car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to CO <sub>2</sub> emissions through a reduction in private car use.	New development should be located in sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links that encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Yes option 1	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to encourage sustainable travel, which should help reduce the need to travel by car. It also seeks to influence the routing of freight all of which should help to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunities to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment mainly because of less use of the private motor car.	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to reduce the impact of transport on rural and urban landscapes by encouraging sustainable travel and a reduction in car use which can cause community severance as well as visual intrusion. Influencing freight routing can also help to reduce the impact on landscapes. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to reduce the	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on landscapes, particularly urban.

Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.62 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								impact of transport on landscapes mainly because of less use of the car.	
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> provides some opportunities to ensure that people have access to a range of services and facilities. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it intends to provide good accessibility.	Work closely with planning officers to ensure that new developments provide either existing or new access to a range of goods and services.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> promotes sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, both of which have considerable health benefits. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to change travel behaviour and encourage alternatives to travelling by car, including cycling and walking.	Work closely with planning and public health officers to ensure that new developments include measures to encourage cycling and walking including access to the countryside and other leisure facilities.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> promotes reducing the need to travel as well as promoting sustainable alternatives to the private motor car when accessing key services which allows for a more socially cohesive society. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to reduce the need to travel by car and travel by sustainable transport alternatives.	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure, will help to provide new residents and communities with access to a range of services and facilities.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> promotes reducing the need to travel as well as promoting sustainable alternatives to the car, which should improve accessibility to a range of services and facilities creating more communities that are inclusive. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to reduce need to travel by car, and promotes some opportunities to travel in a more sustainable way.	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure, will help to provide new residents and communities with access to a range of services and facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	?	<b>Option 1</b> promotes the planning of developments in accessible locations, which will help to provide increased access to education and skills. <b>Option 2</b> does indicate its aims to change travel	

Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.62 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								behaviour however there is no indication of the implications this has for education and skills.	
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes option1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> has the overarching aim of reducing the need to travel and encouraging and promoting sustainable travel choices through a variety of measures. <b>Option 2</b> promotes the need to reduce travel by private car and improving existing transport infrastructure.	Encouraging more sustainable travel will be more effective where it is used in conjunction with other planning policies, which also seek to increase sustainable accessibility.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable travel and accessibility for all communities. This should provide benefits for local economies through increased trading. It also seeks to influence freight routing which enable suppliers to have more effective and economic distribution. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to improve the existing transport infrastructure which provide some benefit for local economies.	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure, will help to provide long-term sustainable economic growth.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable accessibility to employment opportunities. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to increase accessibility to employment opportunities.	

## Core Policy 61: Transport and development

Core Policy 61: Transport and development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.63 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage sustainable travel in new developments. Sustainable travel provides opportunities to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, improve air quality, and reduce noise pollution that will have a positive impact on biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> seeks to provide reduced reliance on the private motor car by providing an efficient and safe public transport network as well as measures to encourage walking and cycling in new developments.</p>	New developments should be located in accessible locations where sustainable transport options are available to all new residents and communities. Where required an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine the full impacts.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> promotes the necessity to locate and design new developments to reduce the need to travel and take advantage of existing infrastructure and services, particularly public transport links and walking and cycling measures. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate an intention locate new development in order to reduce the development.</p>	New developments should be located in accessible locations where both new and existing sustainable transport options are available to all new residents and communities. Where appropriate developer contributions will be sought to secure sustainable transport alternatives.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	+	?	<p><b>Option 1</b> recognises the need to locate and design new development in a manner that provides safe access to the highway as well as safe loading and unloading facilities. This supports the efficient transportation of waste. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate the safe and efficient transportation of waste. More information is required to establish potential effects.</p>	New development must consider the needs of all transport users based on a hierarchy.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<p>Option 1 will have a neutral effect. Option 2 will have a neutral effect.</p>	
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant	LT	R	C	L	0	0	Option 1 will have a neutral effect.	



Core Policy 61: Transport and development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.63 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	effects envisaged.							Option 2 will have a neutral effect.	
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to improve air quality by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to improve air quality through a reduction in private car use.	New development should be located in sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links that encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	B	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions associated with transport by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private motor car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to CO <sub>2</sub> emissions through a reduction in private car use.	New development should be in more sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links which encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to encourage sustainable travel and reduce the need to travel by car in new developments. This has the potential to benefit historical environments through reductions in traffic flow. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunities to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment mainly because of less use of the private motor car, however it is not thought to be of any significance.	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to reduce the impact of transport on rural and urban landscapes by encouraging sustainable travel and a reduction in car use which can cause community severance as well as visual intrusion. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to reduce the impact of transport on landscapes mainly because of less use of the car.	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on landscapes, particularly urban.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to take account of all transport	New developments should be located in

Core Policy 61: Transport and development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.63 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	effects envisaged.							users and promotes safe and sustainable transport to a full range of services, facilities, and opportunities at new developments. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to positively contribute to environmentally sustainable development by providing accessible and safe public transport and encouraging cycling and walking.	accessible locations where both new and existing sustainable transport options are available to all new residents and communities. Where appropriate developer contributions will be sought to secure sustainable transport alternatives.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> promotes sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, both of which have considerable health benefits. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to encourage alternatives to travelling by car, including cycling and walking.	Work closely with planning and public health officers to ensure that new developments include measures to encourage cycling and walking including access to the countryside and other leisure facilities.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to demonstrate that all transport users are considered during the transport assessment stage of new development which will help to ensure a more self contained inclusive society. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to meet the transport needs of people without a car, giving them greater access to more opportunities and activities.	New developments must properly considered the needs of all transport users and seek ensure that all are given equal opportunities to participate fully in life.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> promotes the inclusion of all transport users during the location and design of a new development. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to provide an all encompassing public transport network, as well as providing measures to encourage cycling and walking. This should help those without access to private transport make use of local services, facilities and opportunities.	Where appropriate contributions from developments should be used to improve sustainable transport options so that everyone has greater choice over the type of transport they can use to access key services and facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	?	<b>Option 1</b> promotes the planning of developments in accessible locations, which reduces the need to travel and encourages sustainable transport. This	

Core Policy 61: Transport and development									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.63 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								will help to provide increased access to education and skills. <b>Option 2</b> does indicate its aims to change travel behaviour however there is no indication of the implications this has for education and skills.	
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes option 1	LT	R	C	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that new development is located and designed to reduce the need to travel and encourage the use of sustainable transport. <b>Option 2</b> promotes the need to reduce travel by private car and improving existing public transport and walking and cycling measures.	Encouraging more sustainable travel will be more effective where it is used in conjunction with other planning policies, which also seek to increase sustainable accessibility.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable travel and accessibility for all transport users in new developments This should provide benefits for local economies through increased trading. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to improve the existing transport infrastructure which provide some benefit for local economies.	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure will help to provide long-term sustainable economic growth.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable accessibility to employment opportunities. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to increase accessibility to employment opportunities	This policy option has the potential to provide much greater access to employment hubs and opportunities when used in conjunction with other spatial planning policies which seek to provide local opportunities.

## Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network

Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network Options 1-2 (see section 5.64 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Option 1</b> ensures that developers contribute towards sustainable transport improvements, as well submitting travel plans. However, overall this policy is unlikely to have a neutral effect on biodiversity. <b>Option 2</b> will have a neutral effect.	
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-	-	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to increase land take as part of development proposals.	Where necessary an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine the full impacts.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-	-	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to create considerable amounts of waste during the construction phase.	In mitigation there must be appropriate cleaning of roads and routing of waste (and other construction) traffic.
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-	-	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential for increased surface water run-off during construction phases.	In mitigation there must be appropriate cleaning of roads and routing of waste (and other construction) traffic.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect.	
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should aid improvements to air quality as people become less reliant on their car. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	B	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should aid reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions as people become less reliant on their car. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	

Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.64 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should benefit historic assets as people become less reliant on their car, reducing noise and visual intrusion as well as severance.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.</p>	
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should benefit urban landscapes as people become less reliant on their car, reducing noise and visual intrusion as well as severance.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.</p>	
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should improve access to a range of services and facilities.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.</p>	New development should be in more sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.</p>	New development should be in more sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, such as cycle networks and footpaths.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should improve access to a range of services and facilities, creating greater social inclusion.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.</p>	
<b>13. Community</b>	No significant	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers	

Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.64 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
facilities	effects envisaged.							submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should improve access to a range of services and facilities, creating greater social inclusion and active involvement of local people in community activities. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	
14. Education and skills	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should improve access to a range of services and facilities, including skill based training. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	
15. Transport	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should improve access to a range of services and facilities and reduce reliance on the car. Ensuring access to new development is not directly from the national primary road network should help to ease congestion and journey delays whilst improving journey times and journey time reliability. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	New development should be in more sustainable locations that can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.
16. Economy	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> seek to ensure that access to new development is not directly from the national primary road network. This should help to ease congestion and journey delays whilst improving journey times and journey time reliability.	
17. Employment	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to ensure that developers submit a travel plan and contribute towards sustainable transport improvements. This should	

Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.64 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								improve access to a range of services and facilities, including employment hubs and opportunities. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect.	

### Core Policy 63: Transport strategies

Core Policy 63: Transport strategies									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.65 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+/?	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to achieve a major shift to sustainable transport and therefore reduce the need to travel by car. Sustainable travel provides opportunities to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, improve air quality, and reduce noise pollution, which will have a positive impact on biodiversity. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to reduce the need to travel by car and raising awareness of car dependency, which provide some opportunities to enhance biodiversity.	Sustainable transport options should be supported by developer contributions. Where possible the same principles should be rolled out other plans areas.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	?	+	<b>Option 1</b> does not contain enough information to be able to determine the impact it may have on land and soil. Therefore, it is scored as uncertain. <b>Option 2</b> puts emphasis on reducing the need to travel by car but it also seeks to safeguard land for transport interchanges from inappropriate development.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Option 1</b> is likely to have a neutral effect. <b>Option 2</b> is likely to have a neutral effect	

Core Policy 63: Transport strategies									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.65 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	envisaged.								
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	?	<b>Option 1</b> considers the use of selective road improvements, which may involve improvements to drainage to reduce surface water run-off. However, the information available is limited. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it performs in terms of water resources.	Working alongside the Environment Agency and Natural England to reduce the impact of sedimentation on watercourses.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	?	<b>Option 1</b> considers the use of selective road improvements, which may involve improvements to drainage to reduce surface water run-off. However, the information available is limited. <b>Option 2</b> does not indicate how it performs in terms of flood risk.	It is important to work alongside other service providers and the business community to ensure that the predicted effects of climate change, such as the risk of increased flooding is taken into consideration.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to improve air quality by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to improve air quality through a reduction in private car use.	Where possible development should be located in sustainable locations, which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links that encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	C	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides significant opportunities to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions associated with transport by promoting sustainable travel and reducing the need to travel by private motor car. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to CO <sub>2</sub> emissions through a reduction in private car use.	Where possible development should be located in sustainable locations, which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links, which encourage a change in travel behaviour and a reduction in use of the private motor car.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to achieve a major shift to sustainable travel, which should help reduce the need to travel by car. Cars can have a detrimental effect on historic environments, including pollution, community severance and visual intrusion.	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment. Consider rolling out the



Core Policy 63: Transport strategies									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.65 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunities to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment mainly because of less use of the private motor car.	same policy principles in other areas of the county.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to reduce the impact of transport on rural and urban landscapes by encouraging sustainable travel and a reduction in car use which can cause community severance as well as visual intrusion. Influencing freight routing can also help to reduce the impact on landscapes. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to reduce the impact of transport on landscapes mainly because of less use of the car.	Planning developments in accessible locations can take advantage of existing transport links, which can help to reduce the impact of transport on the historic environment. Consider rolling out the same policy principles in other areas of the county.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Option 1</b> is likely to have a neutral effect. <b>Option 2</b> is likely to have a neutral effect	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> promotes sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, both of which have considerable health benefits. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to change travel behaviour and encourage alternatives to travelling by car, including cycling and walking.	Work closely with planning officers to ensure that developments include measures to encourage cycling and walking including access to the countryside and other leisure facilities.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> promotes reducing the need to travel as well as promoting sustainable alternatives to the private motor car when accessing key services which allows for a more socially cohesive society. <b>Option 2</b> provides some opportunity to reduce the need to travel by car and travel by sustainable alternatives, providing greater access for all.	Roll out policy principles across all of plan area.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> promotes reducing the need to travel as well as promoting sustainable alternatives to the car, which should improve accessibility to a greater range of services and facilities creating more	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure, will help to provide new

Core Policy 63: Transport strategies									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.65 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								communities that are inclusive. <b>Option 2</b> seeks to reduce need to travel by car, and promotes some opportunities to travel in a more sustainable way.	residents and communities with access to a range of services and facilities.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+/0	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to achieve a major shift to sustainable travel by helping to reduce reliance on the car and improve sustainable transport alternatives. This should help to ensure that access to education and skills is far wider reaching. <b>Option 2</b> does indicate its aims to change travel behaviour however there is no indication of the implications this has for education and skills.	
<b>15. Transport</b>	Yes option 1.	LT	R	A	L	++	+	<b>Option 1</b> has the overarching aim of reducing the need to travel and encouraging and promoting sustainable travel choices through a variety of measures. <b>Option 2</b> promotes the need to reduce travel by private car and improving existing transport infrastructure.	Encouraging more sustainable travel will be more effective where it is used in conjunction with other planning policies, which also seek to increase sustainable accessibility.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects envisaged	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable travel and accessibility for communities within the identified towns/areas. This should provide benefits for local economies through increased trading. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to improve the existing transport infrastructure which provide some benefit for local economies.	Planning developments in accessible locations, which can take advantage of existing public transport links and infrastructure will help to provide long-term sustainable economic growth.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1</b> provides opportunities to increase sustainable accessibility to employment opportunities. <b>Option 2</b> provides opportunities to increase accessibility to employment opportunities.	

## Core Policy 64: Demand management

Core Policy 64: Demand management Options 1-2 (see section 5.66 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-/0	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> seeks to manage transport demand through various measures, such as increased management of parking. While new council car parks are not being proposed, the move to minimum residential parking standards will lead to greater land take requirement for parking in new housing developments. This could have implications for biodiversity, such as habitat fragmentation and loss. However, reduced residential parking will be considered where there are urban design or heritage issues.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> is very similar to Option 1, however, it does not include minimum residential parking standards, and therefore there is likely to be less impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Mitigation could include the use of permeable surfaces to reduce surface water run-off.</p> <p>New development should be in more sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.</p>
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-	0	<p><b>Option 1</b> has measures include the use of minimum residential parking standards which could increase land take.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p>	Mitigation could include further emphasis on the use of unallocated communal parking as part of an approach to residential parking.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect.	Mitigation could include the use of permeable surfaces to reduce surface water run-off to reduce the risk of sedimentation entering watercourses.
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect.	Mitigation could include the use of permeable surfaces to reduce surface water run-off.

Core Policy 64: Demand management									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.66 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures which seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. Both could assist in meeting local air quality management area objectives. Improving parking at railway stations could also be positive if it helps people switch to more sustainable modes.	
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives that have the potential to lead to a reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> .	
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. This has the potential to enhance streetscenes. However, there is a danger that people choose to park in nearby streets to avoid paying the parking charge that may have an adverse impact on streetscenes.	Controlled parking schemes need to be considered where commuter /shopper parking is redistributed onto inappropriate streets.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. This has the potential to enhance urban landscapes. However, there is a danger that people choose to park in nearby streets to avoid paying the parking charge that may have an adverse impact on streetscenes.	Controlled parking schemes need to be considered where commuter /shopper parking is redistributed onto inappropriate streets.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	-	0	<b>Option 1</b> includes minimum residential parking standards. This could result is more overall land take for housing because of unreserved parking. <b>Option 2</b> has a neutral effect on this objective.	Reduced residential parking will be considered where there are significant urban design or heritage issues.
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives, including cycling	New development should be in more sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure,

Core Policy 64: Demand management									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.66 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								and walking. This combined with a small reduction in car trips should reduce noise levels in market towns. The effective enforcement of on-street parking and stopping restrictions should be positive for safety, especially for those groups who may struggle to cross roads safely.	including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/0	+/0	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. This should increase accessibility to a range of services and facilities.	New development should be in more sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/0	+/0	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. This should increase accessibility to a range of services and facilities. Parking charges should also lead to a reduction in community severance because of lower traffic levels, particularly in market towns.	New development should be in more sustainable locations which can take advantage of existing infrastructure, including public transport links reducing the new to have access to a car.
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives which have the potential to increase accessibility to skill related services. However, overall unlikely to have a neutral effect.	
<b>15. Transport</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives.	
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives. Reduced traffic volumes will reduce congestion and improve	

Core Policy 64: Demand management									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.66 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								journey time reliability. However, parking charges also have the potential to adversely impact on the local economy.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> both include measures that seek to reduce reliance on the car and encourage use of sustainable transport alternatives which should increase accessibility to some employment areas.	

### Core Policy 65: Movement of goods

Core Policy 65: Movement of goods									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.67 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> seek to encourage HGVs to use roads where there is minimal environmental impact, principally the advisory freight network. Because of this wildlife and biodiversity located along and surrounding the advisory network are likely to suffer with increased adverse impacts, whereas those roads where HGVs are re-routed from stand to benefit from less adverse environmental impact.	Use rail and water networks for distribution of freight wherever possible.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	0	<b>Options 1</b> seeks to achieve sustainable freight distribution, including the transportation of waste. It especially advocates the use of water and rail as a means of transportation.	

Core Policy 65: Movement of goods									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.67 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<b>Option 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	-/?	-/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> could result in increased surface water run-off on the advisory networks, which has the potential to increase sedimentation in watercourses.	Work with the Environment Agency and Natural England to mitigate the effects of excessive surface water run-off
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> both have the potential to improve air quality, particularly when used in conjunction with AQMAs. However, it is likely that the advisory networks and surrounding areas will see reductions in air quality, especially as some journeys lengths with increase as a result.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> both have the potential to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions. However, it is likely that the advisory networks and surrounding areas will see emission increases, especially as some journeys lengths will increase as a result.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver some benefits to historical assets where freight traffic has been re-routed. However for those that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver some benefits landscapes where freight traffic has been re-routed. However, for those that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver greater accessibility. With freight being directed away from many communities through either parking or re-routing there are	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.

Core Policy 65: Movement of goods									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.67 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking as well as improving public transport journey reliability. However, for those that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking, as freight is directed away from many areas and communities. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities for self containment and social inclusion, particularly those without access to a private car. With safer roads, less congested roads there will be more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking, as freight is directed away from many areas and communities. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	Manage the adverse impact of freight on affected areas and communities.
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities for self engagement and social inclusion, particularly those without access to a private car. With safer roads, less congested roads there will be more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking, as freight is directed away from many areas and communities. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	



Core Policy 65: Movement of goods									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.67 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>15. Transport</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<p><b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities for alternative sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>With safer roads, less congested roads there will be more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking, as freight is directed away from many areas and communities. Public transport journey times will also become reliable which may encourage increased patronage. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.</p>	
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<p><b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities for an effective road network allowing businesses to operate more efficiently. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.</p>	Consider the use of both rail and water borne freight where possible.
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<p><b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to deliver more opportunities for alternative sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>With safer roads, less congested roads there will be more opportunities to encourage cycling and walking, as freight is directed away from many areas and communities. Public transport journey times will also become reliable which may encourage increased patronage. This could help to provide greater access to employment opportunities. However, for those communities that are located on or near the advisory network there is likely to be some adverse impacts.</p>	

## Core Policy 66: Strategic transport network

Core Policy 66: Strategic transport network Options 1-2 (see section 5.68 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
<b>1. Biodiversity</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	I	A	L	-	--	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to deliver improvements to the strategic transport network. However, in doing so there could be potential loss of road side verges, trees and other green areas. This is likely to result in some adverse impact on biodiversity, and habitat fragmentation. <b>Option 2</b> is similar to Option 1 but because it includes many more road schemes the adverse impact will be far greater. For example the proposed Harnham Relief Road and Brunel Link crosses the River Avon, which is designated a Special Area of Conservation.	Consultation with Natural England to ascertain appropriate mitigation. Likely mitigation could include appropriate landscaping and vegetation replacement. Where necessary an EIA will be carried out to determine the full impact.
<b>2. Land and soil</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	I	A	L	-	--	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> seek to deliver improvements to the strategic transport network. However, in doing so there could be a potential loss of quality agricultural land and soil.	Appropriate landscape/agricultural assessment to determine quality and value of land at risk. Where necessary an EIA will be carried out to determine the full impact.
<b>3. Waste management</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>4. Water resources</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	0	0	<b>Option 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>5. Flood risk</b>	Yes Option 2	LT	I	A	L	0	--	<b>Option 1</b> has a neutral effect on this objective. <b>Option 2</b> proposes building the Brunel Link Road which is located on a flood plain and therefore which if it were to go ahead would increase the flood risk in other areas.	Where necessary an EIA will be carried out to determine the full impact.
<b>6. Air quality and environmental pollution</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to deliver a more efficient and effective transport network. This will help to ease congestion and improve traffic flow; this has the potential to improve air quality in some areas. However, those roads, which have increases in traffic could see air quality decline.	Air quality management plans could be used to determine where priorities lay.

Core Policy 66: Strategic transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.68 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								<b>Option 2</b> proposes many more road schemes which are likely to increase incidents of poor air quality in many areas.	
<b>7. Climatic factors</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	<b>Option 1</b> seeks to deliver a more efficient and effective transport network. Doing will help to ease congestion and improve traffic flow; this has the potential to reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in some areas. However, those roads, which have increases in traffic, could see emissions rise. <b>Option 2</b> proposes many more road schemes which are likely to increase emissions in many areas.	
<b>8. Historic environment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> may result in some enhancements to the character and distinctiveness of some historical assets as traffic is re-routed to other roads. However, there could also be some direct impacts to the historical environment as result of physical measures to tackle congestion.	Where necessary a EIA will be carried out to determine the full impact of the road scheme proposals.
<b>9. Rural and urban landscapes</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	-/?	<b>Option 1</b> may result in some in reduced queuing at congestion hotspots that will generally improve the overall quality of certain areas, especially the SSCTs and other market towns. However, physical measures such as reconfiguring junctions can have a negative impact on the quality of landscapes. <b>Option 2</b> proposes many more new road schemes. Whilst this has potential benefits for urban landscapes as traffic is re-routed to other roads there is potential for these schemes to have an adverse impact on rural landscapes.	Where appropriate an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine the full impact.
<b>10. Housing</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to encourage sustainable travel in local areas and communities. Reduced traffic and severance in local towns will encourage increased cycling and walking, and public transport patronage thus improving access to goods and services. However, reductions in congestion and improved journey times can also encourage further use of the car,	

Core Policy 66: Strategic transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.68 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
								which negates any positives previously gained.	
<b>11. Healthy communities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to reduce traffic and severance in local areas and this will help to encourage both cycling and walking.	The implementation of appropriate cycling and walking measures should also be considered alongside improvements to the road network to help encourage these healthy modes of travel.
<b>12. Poverty and deprivation</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to increase the use of sustainable travel in local areas and communities. Reductions in traffic and severance and increases in road safety should help to encourage sustainable travel, particularly those without access to a car. This will help to promote more self contained and inclusive communities. However, reductions in congestion and improved journey times can also encourage further use of the car, which negates any positives previously gained.	
<b>13. Community facilities</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to increase access to a range of services and allow individuals to participate in community activities. Reductions in traffic and severance and increases in road safety should help to encourage sustainable travel, particularly those without access to a car. However, reductions in congestion and improved journey times can also encourage further use of the car, which negates any positives previously gained.	
<b>14. Education and skills</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	0	0	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
<b>15. Transport</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	C	L	+/?	+/?	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> have the potential to ease congestion which can encourage further use of the car. However, bus journey time reliability should also improve and increase accessibility to services.	Other demand measures could be used to reduce reliance on the car, such as parking charges.
<b>16. Economy</b>	No significant	LT	R	C	L	+	+	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> both have the potential to manage routes	

Core Policy 66: Strategic transport network									
Options 1-2 (see section 5.68 of main report for details of options)									
Sustainability appraisal objective	Are significant effects likely?	Assessment of effects				Sig.		Justification and evidence	Suggested mitigation and enhancement measures
		T	R	S	L	Op 1	Op 2		
	effects envisaged.							effectively and improve journey time reliability, which are generally seen as business development catalysts and support long-term sustainable economic growth.	
<b>17. Employment</b>	No significant effects envisaged.	LT	R	A	L	+	+	<b>Options 1 &amp; 2</b> both have the potential to protect and enhance the vitality and vibrancy of existing employment areas through improvements to the road and rail networks.	

### Core Policy 67: Flood risk

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This includes a review of the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.69 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	0	Neutral effect.
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	0	Neutral effect.
<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	+	Positive impact. The effects of flooding on health and well being have been well documented over the last two years.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	+	The policy ensures that people are as safe as possible from flood incidents, so there will be a positive impact on this SA objective. Access to homes for escape or emergency services is included in FRAs.
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	0	Neutral effect.
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect.
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral effect.
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and</b>	0	Neutral effect.

recycling		
9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	0	Neutral effect.
10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas	0	Neutral effect.
11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use	0	Neutral effect.
12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency	++	The policy directly addresses this objective.
13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion	0	Neutral effect.
14. Maintain and improve river quality	0	Neutral effect.
15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	0	Neutral effect.
16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes	0	Neutral effect.
17. Facilitate economic growth & development of new businesses	+	Indirect impact as flooding of premises has adverse impacts on the economy.
18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth	0	Neutral effect.
19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills	0	Neutral effect.
20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities	0	Neutral effect.
21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres	0	Neutral effect.
22. Promote development of highest standard	0	Neutral effect.
23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites	0	Neutral effect.

### Core Policy 68: Water resources

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This includes a review of the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.70 main report for further details.

South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective	Significance	Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)
1. Social inclusion for all	0	Neutral effect
2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home	0	Neutral effect

<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	0	Neutral effect
	Amended +	Strong measures for achieving water efficiency and protecting water resources will have direct health benefits for the population, including protecting drinking water from pollution and adaptation to potential future water shortages resulting from climate change.
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy from renewable sources</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	++	Directly requires new residential development to achieve higher water efficiency standards.
	+	Benefits from this policy but flooding is addressed through Core Policy 67.
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	+	River water quality would be likely to benefit through less likelihood of low flows affecting water quality in upper reaches of rivers.
	++ Amended	
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	++	Directly addresses potential effects of increased water use from new development.
	Amended +	This policy will benefit biodiversity through protection of water resources and minimising water use but implementation of this policy not considered to result in significant benefits against this objective.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	+	Likely to benefit landscapes indirectly through less likelihood of low flows affecting upper reaches of rivers.
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	?	There will be additional costs to developers and (perhaps all/partly passed on to) new residents arising from more costly fittings and installations required to achieve

		higher water efficiency standards. A study by the Environment Agency (Assessing the cost of compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes, 2007) finds the likely cost of CSH level 3 standards just under £300 more per dwelling, which is considered unlikely to be significant to house builders. Reductions in water usage are also understood to be likely to reduce running costs to water companies and water customers/residents.
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	+	Promotes high sustainability standards in new development.
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	0	Neutral effect

### **Core Policy 69: Protection of the River Avon SAC**

This policy was originally included in the South Wilts Core Strategy which has been through an Examination in Public (EiP). This includes a review of the original assessment from the South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. See section 5.71 main report for further details.

<b>South Wilts Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal objective</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Assessment of Effects Nature of the sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood)</b>
<b>1. Social inclusion for all</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>2. Ensure that everyone has a decent home</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>3. Improve health and well being of population</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>4. Improve safety and reduce crime</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>5. Improve and protect accessibility to all services and facilities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>6. Improve availability and accessibility to open space, including greenspace</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>7. Increase energy efficiency of buildings, promote energy</b>	0	Neutral effect



<b>from renewable sources</b>		
<b>8. Reduce waste generation and increase levels of reuse and recycling</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>9. Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>10. Promote sustainable transport by improving affordable and accessible solutions particularly in rural areas</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>11. Make efficient use of land, maximise brownfield use</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>12. Respond to threats proposed by flooding, promote water efficiency</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>13. Improve road safety and reduce congestion</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>14. Maintain and improve river quality</b>	++	Directly responds to need to overcome potential water quality effects from new development on River Avon SAC, arising from HRA.
<b>15. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	++	Directly responds to need to overcome potential water quality effects from new development on River Avon SAC, arising from HRA.
<b>16. Conserve and enhance the District's landscapes</b>	+	Likely to benefit landscapes indirectly through less likelihood of waste water discharges affecting River Avon catchment.
<b>17. Facilitate economic growth &amp; development of new businesses</b>	?	There will be additional costs to developers and (perhaps all/partly passed on to) new residents arising from the need to contribute to a Phosphate (now Nutrient) Management Plan, with financial costs uncertain at this stage. The policy does not currently allow for alternative means of avoiding impact on the River Avon from wastewater discharges via sewage treatment works, and the need to allow alternative approaches should be considered.
<b>18. Provide suitable infrastructure to promote business growth</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>19. Raise educational attainment and workforce skills</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>20. Harness economic benefits that arise from tourism/cultural activities</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>21. Maintain and enhance the viability/vitality of existing businesses and town centres</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>22. Promote development of highest standard</b>	0	Neutral effect
<b>23. Protect and maintain Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, SAMs and archaeological sites</b>	0	Neutral effect





This document was published by the Spatial Plans team, Wiltshire Council, Economy and Regeneration.

For further information please visit the following website:

<http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal>